

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES
FEB 19 1951

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

CONTENTS

	PAGE
WASSERMAN, EARL R.—Unedited Letters by Sterne, Hume, and Rousseau,	73
WARDROPPER, BRUCE W.—'Honor' in the Sacramental Plays of Valdivielso and Lope de Vega, - - - - -	81
LEGOUIS, PIERRE.—Dryden's Letter to "Ormond," - - - - -	88
LAPP, JOHN C.—The Dénouement of Mérimée's 'La Chambre bleue,' - - -	93
GRUBBS, HENRY A.—The Pseudonym of Isidore Ducasse, - - - - -	98
HARVEY, EDWARD.—Edouard Estaunié, Critic and Reviewer, - - -	100
COE, CHARLES NORTON.—A Source for Wordsworth's Sonnet, "The Black Stones of Iona," - - - - -	102

REVIEWS:—

H. F. FLETCHER (ed.), John Milton's Complete Poetical Works. [Maurice Kelley.] - - - - -	103
KARL VIETOR, Goethe, Dichtung—Wissenschaft—Weltbild; Goethe, The Poet; Goethe, The Thinker. [Oskar Seidlin.] - - - - -	107
MAURICE GRAVIER, Strindberg et le théâtre moderne. [Carol K. Bang.] - - -	110
J. LE GAY BRERETON and R. G. HOWARTH, Writings on Elizabethan Drama; J. W. WIELER, George Chapman; BRENTS STIRLING, The Populace in Shakespeare. [Sidney Thomas.] - - - - -	113
F. MICHAEL KROUSE, Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition. [A. S. P. Woodhouse.] - - - - -	116
J. H. WILSON, The Court Wits of the Restoration; J. H. SMITH, The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy. [Brice Harris.] - - - - -	118
C. M. BOWRA, The Romantic Imagination. [R. D. Havens.] - - - - -	120
W. A. BORST, Lord Byron's First Pilgrimage 1809-1811. [Guy Steffan.] - - -	121
ARTHUR WORMHOUDT, The Demon Lover. [R. H. Fogle.] - - - - -	123
R. L. RUSK, The Life of Ralph Waldo Emerson. [S. T. Williams.] - - -	126
E. H. EBY, A Concordance of Walt Whitman's <i>Leaves of Grass</i> and Selected Prose Writings. [Sculley Bradley.] - - - - -	128
RICHARD CHASE, Herman Melville. [Harrison Hayford.] - - - - -	129
N. F. ADKINS, Philip Freneau and the Cosmic Enigma. [J. L. Blau.] - - -	131
AGNES M. SIBLEY, Alexander Pope's Prestige in America, 1725-1835. [J. O. Eidson.] - - - - -	133
A. J. GUERARD, Thomas Hardy: The Novels and Stories. [S. C. Chew.] - - -	134
SUSANNE HOWE, Novels of Empire. [S. C. Chew.] - - - - -	136
HERBERT IHERING (ed.), Theaterstadt Berlin, Ein Almanach; Theater der Welt, Ein Almanach. [E. E. Miller.] - - - - -	137
LISA GLAUSER, Die Erlebte Rede im Englischen Roman des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. [Ernest Bernbaum.] - - - - -	138
HERMANN PAUL und HEINZ STOLTE, Kurze Deutsche Grammatik. [Arno Schirokauer.] - - - - -	140
BRIEF MENTION: WILLIAM ELTON, A Glossary of the New Criticism; V. H. BROMBERT, The Criticism of T. S. Eliot; T. R. PALFREY (ed.), <i>Le Panorama littéraire de l'Europe</i> (1833-1834); E. G. COX, A Reference Guide to Travel Literature, Vol. III (England). - - -	142

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
KEMP MALONE

CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston,
Pedro Salinas, Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer, E. R. Wasserman

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, *not* vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the *editors* with an indication of the *total* number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

Perfect Your FRENCH

. . . in this natural French setting



at MCGILL UNIVERSITY FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL

MONTREAL—JUNE 28 TO AUGUST 9, 1951

Perfect your French, for professional use or for business or pleasure, in the natural, attractive French atmosphere of McGill's popular, long-established French Summer School at Montreal. Ideal study, conversational, residential course for teachers, students, and business people; also for advanced students of good intellectual ability who aim at graduate work in McGill. French alone spoken at all times in residence. Tuition is of unusually high standards by experienced French university teachers. Resident scholarships and university credit certificates. Co-educational. Luxurious accommodation in Royal Victoria College, interesting social amenities, music and dramatics.

Director,
Write now for
prospectus to:
French
Summer
School

Fee (board, residence and tuition) \$285. (Canadian)
(Tuition only, \$125.)

MCGILL UNIVERSITY
MONTREAL, CANADA

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland. Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

rs
ne
pt
es
ne
of
o-
of
p,
rs
ss

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXVI

FEBRUARY, 1951

Number 2

UNEDITED LETTERS BY STERNE, HUME, AND ROUSSEAU

In 1825 the *European Magazine*, initiating a new series, announced that it would print serially a number of letters, theretofore unpublished, by Laurence Sterne, John Wesley, (William ?) Cowper, Allan Ramsay (the painter), Hume, and Rousseau, "with others connected with the event of Rousseau's visit to England."¹ It is clear that when the *European Magazine* came to an end in 1826 the publication of the correspondence had not been completed, for no letter by Cowper appears, and although the letters were to cover the years 1766-69, the date of the latest published is 1767. Most of the correspondence published, once the property of Richard Davenport, at whose Wootton estate Rousseau lived, has since found its way into the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Publique de Neuchâtel, and has been republished; but its appearance in the *European Magazine* seems to have escaped the notice of recent editors of the correspondence of Hume and Rousseau,² and

¹ *European Magazine*, n. s. I (1825), 43.

² The following letters in *The Letters of David Hume*, ed. J. Y. T. Greig (Oxford, 1932) appear there as "hitherto unpublished in England" but were published in the *European Magazine*: 325, 327, 329, 331, 332, 335, 339, 340, 350. Because a piece has been torn from the manuscript of 329, the date appears in Greig only as June 1766; in the *European Magazine*, the date is 24 June 1766. The following letters in the *Correspondance Générale de J.-J. Rousseau*, ed. Théophile Dufour (Paris, 1924-34) also appear in the *European Magazine*: 2964, 2977, 3000, 3008, 3015, 3050, 3055, 3093, 3094, 3103, 3119, 3127, 3143, 3149, 3175, 3188, 3231, 3232, 3239, 3240, 3243, 3248, 3257, 3288, 3302, 3306, 3307, 3318, 3341, 3515. In transcribing Rousseau's letters, I have corrected a few obvious errors that appear in the *European Magazine*.

some few letters, here reprinted, have not been detected since their publication in 1825-26.

Coxwold, near York

June 9, 1767

Dear Sir,

I have this moment received your obliging letter,—and without staying to read it a second time, have thrust aside my *Sentimental Journey*, immediately to acknowledge, and thank you for it and its contents—which by the by, are safer in your pocket than mine, so pray give them room, till I have the pleasure of seeing you in town, or elsewhere. This nasty gout! it's enough to cut away half the comfort of a man's life—I wish it was the portion of splenetic philosophers, and Tartuffe's of all denominations,—at least I should not torment my philanthropy much about them; but when it falls upon an open cheerful hearted man, who would do God honour—I grieve from my soul that such feelings should be thwarted—and would write or fight with more zeal to restore him to himself, than all the *subscriptions* or *subsidies* in the world could kindle in me, in another case; and now I have named subscriptions, I might thank you again (if I chose it) for those you have procured me; however, I should wish to know, if any are upon imperial paper,³ that it may be so marked in the printed list of their names, who have done me so much honour in this work. I am now seriously set down to it—that is, I began this morning; a five weeks illness, which by the by, *ought* to have killed me—but that I made a point of it, not to break faith with the world, and in short *would* not die, (for in some cases, I hold this affair to be an act of the will). This long illness, which confined me a month to my room, reduced me and my imagination with me, to such mere shadows, that it was not till last night that I felt the least powers or temptations (either ghostly or bodily) within me for what I had undertaken. I have now set to, and shall not take my pen from my paper till I have finished.

By heaven! I think mine is a life of the oddest and most tragi-comic incidents in nature; this very morning that I set about writing my *Sentimental Journey* through France,—have I received a letter from my wife, who is at Marseilles, advertising, that she is going (not to write,—but what is a much better thing) that she is going to make a *Sentimental Journey* through France, and post it a thousand miles, merely to pay me a visit of three months.⁴—The deuce take all *Sentimental Journeys*!—I wish there had never been such a thing thought of by man or woman—tres menses! cum uxore neque leni neque commodâ!—quid faciam?—quo me vertam?—It will quicken my sentiments however. I know not by what

³ In the list of subscribers for the *Sentimental Journey*, Davenport is recorded for a copy on imperial paper.

⁴ Professor Lewis P. Curtis, editor of *The Letters of Laurence Sterne* (Oxford, 1935), has kindly pointed out to me the similarity of this passage to one in the "Journal to Eliza," June 20, 1767 (*ibid.*, p. 363). Sterne frequently repeated in the Journal sections of his other correspondence.

authority I go on writing thus to you, without one premeditated thought—but I mean it civilly; for to those I like and esteem, so must I write—or not at all—I wish I could conjure your gout, or rather the causes of it, into the Red Sea, in *secula seculorum*. But I fear it has too much the nature of original sin in it, or of the obstinacy of that spirit which departeth not, but by much prayer and fasting—if even with that.

Lord God! what weather! till yesterday, nothing but pining penetrating north-east winds—my poor vessel could well have spared this stress, and I fear yours would feel it even before you drew your curtains in the morning. I had once taken up a large folio sheet—you had a narrow escape—for I should have filled it as full as this; God send you well and out of your chamber.

I am, my dear sir, with much esteem,
Your obliged and humble servant,

L. STERNE.

To Richard Davenport, Esq. Brereton Green, Cheshire.

To ----- Fitzherbert, Esq.,⁵ in Queen Anne's Street, Cavendish-square.

Sir,

I called on you this morning, in order to speak to you about poor Rousseau, who is still somewhat undetermined in his projects; I told him of the kind offer you made him, of which he retains a due sense; but when I told him that your sister lived in the house, he feared that he would constrain her, and he was very sorry that he could reap no advantage by your goodness. I then told him of Mr. Davenport's offer, which, as Mr. Garrick tells me, you mentioned to him. He seems to like it extremely, and I doubt not but he may accept of it, provided Mr. Davenport will accept of board. I hope he will be so indulgent as to comply with this caprice of my friend; and I would propose thirty pounds a year for board, firing, and washing.⁶ I mention this sum, because M. Rousseau can spare it, and it was mentioned as the board he should pay for himself and his governante, to a farmer in Wales.⁷ I shall only propose a few questions:—1. Is there wood and hills about Mr. Davenport's house? 2. Cannot Mr. Rousseau, if he should afterwards think proper, find a means to boil a pot, and roast a piece of meat, in Mr. Davenport's house, so as to be perfectly at home? 3. Will M. Davenport, in that case, be so good as to accept of a small rent for an apartment; for this circumstance, I find is necessary. 4. Can Mr. Rousseau set out presently and take possession of his habitation? I should be glad, if by your means I could have a conversa-

⁵ Doubtless William Fitzherbert of Tissington in Derbyshire (*DNB*, XIX, p. 166), a friend of Johnson and Garrick.

⁶ This passage is very similar to one in Grieg, II, p. 25.

⁷ See Grieg, II, p. 8.

tion with Mr. Davenport; and shall wait on him, at any time or place, he shall please to appoint me.

I am Sir,
Your most obedient humble servant,
DAVID HUME.

At Miss Elliot's, in Lisle-street, Leicester-Fields, Tuesday afternoon.⁸

To Mr. Davenport

Lisle-Street, Leicester Fields, 17 of May, 1766.

Dear Sir,

It is very remarkable, that at the same instant when Mr. Rousseau appears to you in so good humour, he represents himself to General Conway as overwhelmed with the deepest affliction on account of some most unexpected misfortune; and he even says that his profound melancholy deprives him, for the time, of the use of his understanding.⁹ You will also think it more remarkable if I tell you, that he has refused the king's bounty, though he had allowed me to collect it, had allowed Mr. Conway to apply for it, had wrote to Lord Mareschal to obtain his consent for accepting it, and had given me authority to notify this consent to Mr. Conway: and though in all this affair he may seem to have used the king ill, and Mr. Conway and Lord Mareschal, and me, above all, he makes no apology for his conduct, and never writes me a word about it. So singular and odd he is in all his caprices. But we must allow him to have his own way; and as he has never spoke of the matter to you, it will be impossible for you to enter into it.

I send you enclosed a letter wrote to me by Monsieur Peyrou, his great friend at Neufchatel, who seems to me a man of merit.¹⁰ You will see by it that M. Rousseau is entirely satisfied with the reception you have given him.

I shall not fail to profit of the kind invitation which you are pleased to give me.

I am, dear Sir,
Your most obedient and most humble servant,
DAVID HUME.

P. S. I have wrote to M. Rousseau this post under the same cover with yours.¹¹

⁸ The contents of this letter indicate that it was probably written in late February or early March 1766.

⁹ Rousseau's letter to General Conway appears in Dufour, xv, p. 233.

¹⁰ Peyrou's letter appears in Dufour, xv, p. 202.

¹¹ The letter to Rousseau appears in Grieg, II, p. 48; and the letter to Davenport reprinted here is referred to in Grieg, II, p. 49.

Hume to Davenport

Dear Sir,

I find the affair of Rousseau's pension is quite finished, all except the formal part, which I would instantly solicit, did not General Conway think that you had better inform him previously of the matter, lest some new caprice should seize him, and lead him to regret anew his Majesty's bounty. After he has notified to you or to General Conway his acceptance, it will be easy, in a day or two, to have the warrant passed at the Treasury.

I am, dear Sir,
your most obedient humble servant,

David Hume.

20th of March [1767]

Rousseau to Davenport

Voici, Monsieur, une lettre pour vous que j'ai ouverte la croyant pour moi; j'en suis fâché, mais c'est un effet inévitable des arrangements que vous m'avez permis de prendre. Ne la jugeant pas pressée j'attendois pour vous la remettre votre arrivée dont on me flattoit depuis quelques jours. Je profite pour vous l'envoyer d'un envoi de M. Walton, et de peur de trop grossir son paquet j'écris sur le revers de la même lettre, vous priant de me pardonner cette liberté.

J'attends de jour à autre le plaisir de voir arriver en bonne santé le cher grand papa et sa chère famille. Mlle. le Vasseur vous prie, Monsieur, d'agréer son respect; et de vouloir bien assurer sa belle correspondante de l'empressement qu'elle a de la revoir et que je partage. Je vous demande, Monsieur, la continuation de vos bontés et de votre amitié, et vous assure pour ma vie du plus véritable attachement.

A Wooton, le 18 9bre. 1766.

J. J. ROUSSEAU.

Rousseau to Davenport

A Wooton, le 21 Fev. 1767.

Si j'avois prévu, Monsieur, tous les embarras que vous donnent mes misérables livres je n'aurois pas eu l'indiscretion de vous y exposer, et s'ils pouvoient rester chez vous dans quelque coin de garde-meuble je ne songerois plus à les vendre; mais qu'en faire lorsque vous quitterez votre appartement? voila la difficulté. J'ai répondu à M. Dutens en le priant de voir s'il n'y auroit point dans sa maison quelque coin vuide où il put les jeter. J'avois imaginé, je l'avoue, que ce seroit dans vos jours de mal-aise une espèce d'amusement pour vous de les feuilleter à loisir, et de mettre à part peu-à-peu ceux qui pourroient vous convenir ou à quelqu'un de vos amis. Vous y auriez fait mettre le prix par un libraire, tout le

reste eut été mis au feu, et tout se seroit ainsi passé sans bruit et sans que le public en sut rien. Mais je vous avoue que tout cet éclat de vente me fait une mortelle peine, et je voudrois que M. du Peyron eut jetté tous ces bouquins dans le lac quand il prit le parti de me les envoyer bien malgré moi.

Le paquet que vous avez eu la bonté de m'envoyer en dernier lieu et que je n'ai pas encore reçu contient les feuilles de mon dictionnaire de musique, qui n'est pas encore publié; le libraire, qui attend pour cela que je les aye vues, avoit pris la liberté de vous les adresser directement; mais mon cousin,¹² officieux comme à son ordinaire, a intercepté le paquet et l'a retenu quinze jours plus. Ce retard m'est très indifférent, mais il nuit beaucoup au libraire. Je vous suis très obligé de la bonté que vous avez eue de faire partir le paquet tout de suite.

La pluie est enfin cessée, mais nous avons de terribles vents. Comme je ne les crois pas aussi mauvais pour votre état, j'espère et desire avec impatience apprendre dans peu que vous êtes mieux. Mes honneurs, je vous supplie et ceux de Mlle. le Vasseur à vos chers enfans et à vos Dames. Agreez ses respects et mes très humbles salutations.

J. J. ROUSSEAU.

Ci-joint 2 lettres auxquelles je vous prie, Monsieur, de vouloir bien donner cours.

Rousseau to Davenport

A Wooton, le 14 Mars, 1767.

J'espère, Monsieur, que l'attaque vive et opiniâtre que vous venez d'essayer aura cédé au retour du beau tems que je suppose et desire être à Londres comme ici, et j'attends avec bien de l'impatience la nouvelle de votre rétablissement. Pour moi ma fluxion sur les dents s'est à peu près dissipée et c'est toujours un mal de moins.

Les médailles dont vous me parlez, Monsieur, ne valent pas la peine qu'on en fasse une destination; à moins que Monsieur votre petit fils n'en veuille jouer aux petits palets. De cela comme de tout ce qui peut vous embarrasser provenant des mêmes caisses, je ne puis que vous prier de le faire jeter aux balayures; car pour moi je ne sais qu'en faire absolument. Mais je prends la liberté de vous recommander le portrait de Mylord Mareschal qui vous a été renvoyé par Mylord Nuneham, et je vous supplie de vouloir bien le faire mettre avec soin dans la malle, étendu dans quelque livre de Musique ou autre afin qu'il ne se chiffonne pas.

Mes honneurs je vous prie et ceux de Mlle. le Vasseur à vos chers enfans et à toute votre maison. Et recevez, Monsieur, nos très humbles salutations.

J. J. ROUSSEAU.

Permettez que je vous prie de vouloir bien donner cours à l'incluse.

¹² Jean Rousseau, whom Rousseau reprimanded for this interference (Dufour, no. 3263).

Rousseau to Davenport

A Wooton, le 23 Mars, 1767.

Connoissant, Monsieur, l'excellence de votre cœur paternel j'ai été saisi et troublé de la maladie de Monsieur, votre petit fils, encore plus pour vous que pour lui, vu les ressources et la force de la nature a son age; au lieu que les terreurs et l'effroi ne trouvent aucune defense en vous. Heureusement j'apprens en même tems qu'il est mieux, et il n'en falloit pas moins pour me rassurer sur votre état. Donnez-moi de ses nouvelles, je vous en prie, ainsi que des vôtres. L'opiniatreté de l'attaque que vous venez d'essuyer me fait espérer aussi que pour longtems vous en serez quite, et en vérité c'est un état bien cruel et bien triste que de souffrir du cœur et du corps tout à la fois. Personne ne sait cela mieux que moi.

Je n'avois assurément pas lieu de m'attendre à la grace dont le Roi vient de m'honorer, et jamais quoiqu'on puisse dire, je ne me croirai un personnage assez important pour que S. M. ni ses ministres daignent d'eux-mêmes s'occuper de moi. Toute-fois je recevrai comme je le dois cette grace, et je ne manquerai pas d'écrire dans la semaine à M. le Général Conway.

Sera-ce assez pour M. Lewis de deux guinées?¹³ Faites en sorte, je vous prie, que non seulement il soit content, mais qu'il doive l'être.

Nous saluons toute votre maison. Mlle. le Vasseur vous prie d'agréer ses respects et j'y joins, Monsieur, mes salutations très humbles.

J. J. ROUSSEAU.

Je vous prie de vouloir bien donner cours à l'incluse.¹⁴

EARL R. WASSERMAN

The Johns Hopkins University

¹³ See Dufour, nos. 3303 and 3315.

¹⁴ The following letters also appear in the *European Magazine*.

To Richard Davenport

I am afraid, Sir, I shall not have an opportunity of procuring you those tunes till I return to London. The gentleman from whom I expected to procure them is not yet come hither.

I have desired Mr. Swindells to beg your acceptance of two or three little tracts which perhaps you have not seen. I had forgot to mention one, which, (if you have it not already,) would probably give you pleasure. The title is (nearly) this, "A Letter to a Bishop, occasioned by some late Discoveries in Religion." There are two parts of it.

May I request one thing of you, Sir? Do not speak evil of Jesus Christ. You may some time stand in need of him; and if you should,

(I can say from a very little experience,) you will find him the best friend in Heaven or Earth.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN WESLEY.

23d October, 1749

To Richard Davenport
Sir,

I hope by this time you have given shelter under your roof to *my* Jean Jaques Rousseau; who, if he should prove less witty, will be, at the same time, less ungrateful, less mischievous, and less changeable, than his predecessor. I am afraid, however, that both of them are attended with more expence than their company is worth, as you will see by the note which, in obedience to your commands, I have enclosed, who am, with great respect,

Sir,
Your most obliged and most humble servant,
ALLAN RAMSAY.

London, June 16, 1767.

To Richard Davenport
Sir,

I have received the money of your draught for Rousseau's picture and frame,* for which I give you a great many thanks. As to the *original*, in every sense of the word, the last advices we had of him were by Lady Holland, who arrived at Calais the day after he left it, and where he had entertained the simple inhabitants with the *hair-breadth 'scapes* his liberty and life had made in England. Where he has disposed of himself we have not yet learnt; but so much importance will not continue long anywhere without being discovered.

I am, with great respect, Sir,
Your most obliged and most humble servant,
ALLAN RAMSAY.

London, July 8th, 1767.

* Mr. Davenport to Isaac Gosset of Dallain.

April 24, 1764.	£.	s.	d.
For a $\frac{3}{4}$ Frame, oil gold	2	2	0
And Case for ditto	0	6	0
	2	8	0
To Mr. Ramsay, for the picture of Mon. Rousseau	21	0	0
	23	8	0

HONOR IN THE SACRAMENTAL PLAYS OF VALDIVIELSO AND LOPE DE VEGA

Menéndez Pidal has shown that, from the time of the national epic down to the seventeenth century, there were some Spaniards who endorsed the code of *honor*, and others who disapproved of it.¹ The more traditional forms of literature (the ballads and the drama, which trace their ancestry back to the epic) transmitted and upheld the *honor* code, while the less traditional forms (the *novelas*) rejected or criticized it. The two attitudes to *honor* meet in Lope de Vega: in his theatre the rigors of *honor* are a principal theme,² but in his *novelas* he opposed the code vehemently.³

Lope de Vega's work shows the *honor* code in a moment of crisis. Even in the drama he is intolerant of its severity.⁴ The dramatists of his "school" sense the same crisis. Tirso de Molina, while continuing to use *honor* as a theme, shows even less respect for it than Lope. Ruiz de Alarcón sublimates it.⁵ *Las muñecas de Marcela* (1636), of Cubillo de Aragón, is a treatise on the absurdities of *pundonor*. Only in Calderón is the code of *honor* restored without reservation as a dramatic motif.⁶

¹ "Del honor en el teatro español," in *De Cervantes y Lope de Vega*, Buenos Aires, 1940, 155-184.

² Cf. Lope de Vega, *Arte nuevo*, in H. J. Chaytor, *Dramatic Theory in Spain*, Cambridge, 1925, 27: "Los casos de la honra son mejores,/ porque mueven con fuerza a toda gente." W. L. Fichter, in the Introduction to his edition of *El castigo del discreto*, p. 28, notes that some fifty of Lope's extant plays deal with *honor*.

³ "He sido de parecer siempre que no se lava bien la mancha de la honra del agraviado con la sangre del que le ofendió." *Las más prudente venganza*, quoted by Menéndez Pidal, *op. cit.*, 171. Lope recommends that a man who finds himself in this situation should go away and live in a place where he is not known; he should "perder la patria." Cf. Alfonso García Valdecasas, *El hidalgo y el honor*, Madrid, 1948, 221.

⁴ Valdecasas, *op. cit.*, 216-7.

⁵ Cf. *BAE*, xx, 2: "Mas queda desta manera/ satisfecha la honra mía,/ que si ya pude mataros/ más he hecho en perdonaros/ que en daros la muerte haría./ Matar pude, vencedor/ de vos solo; mas así/ he vencido a vos y a mí,/ que es la vitoria mayor."

⁶ Valdecasas, *op. cit.*, 211.

The critical moment for the *honor* principle can be illuminated by a study of the *auto sacramental* of the time. The advantage of studying the theme in this setting is that the *auto* was then a blend of popular and learned art and thought. Although the genre as a whole did not descend in unbroken tradition from the epic, it incorporated material that did. This blend was, by Lope's time, the result of a century of experimental search for a Eucharistic dramatic formula.⁷ The *auto sacramental* was therefore, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the only genre that had to come to terms with the problem posed by a comparison of *honor* ethics and Christian ethics.

This problem was the irreconcilability of the two codes. *Honor* was based on appearances rather than on eternal realities, on man's judgment rather than on God's. It implied an obligation, not to forgive, but to avenge. Christian doctrine, on the other hand, required forgiveness of personal injury up to the seventy times seventh time. And in the particular sphere of *honor*—conjugal relations—Christ had asked his followers not to judge the woman taken in adultery, but to forgive her. The two bodies of doctrine were evidently opposed.⁸ The difficulty was that, in the popular mind, both codes of behavior were axiomatic.⁹ As a man the Spaniard had to avenge his dishonor; as a Christian he had to forgive his dishonorer. It was impossible to be both a man of *honor* and a Christian. Some practical solution of the impasse had to be found.

It was, as Américo Castro has shown,¹⁰ the Spanish casuists who

⁷ The search for a dramatic formula for the *auto sacramental* is the subject of another article to be published elsewhere.

⁸ Dramatists frequently commented on this opposition. Cf. Moreto, *Las travesuras de Pantoja*, BAE, xxxix, 396: "Dijo Dios 'no matarás.'/ Si lo cumplo, noble he sido./ De modo que dice Dios/ que no mate y tendré honra;/ y tú dices que es deshonor./ ¿Somos cristianos los dos,/ o no lo somos? Yo quiero/ guardar lo que Dios me dice,/ aunque el diablo se autorice/ de mundano caballero."

⁹ "El conflicto entre los preceptos de la moral cristiana y la moral propia de la sociedad no es exclusivo de ninguna época. Lo singular era la intensidad con que ambos principios morales se vivían, y que dió ocasión a que tantas veces el contraste se señalara en la literatura": Valdecasas, *op. cit.*, 217.

¹⁰ "Observaciones acerca del concepto del honor en los siglos XVI y XVII," RFE, III, 1916, 39 ff.

were the most consistent among professional Christians in upholding the *honor* code. When the findings of theology were applied to the world, they were subtly modified by the world. The casuists spoke of *honor* as a *bien temporal* and as *de inferior orden*.¹¹ Ascetes, hermits, religious, who flee the world, may try to rule their lives according to undiluted Christian ethics. Those who cannot flee the world must conform to Christian ethics insofar as they are expedient. Restitution, for example, is not always expedient. Hence the casuists absolved a sinner of the need to make restitution whenever it involved risk to life, or—what is the same thing—risk to *honor*.¹² *Bienes temporales* and *bienes espirituales* cannot always be attained by the same man. It is better to have a *bien temporal* than none at all. *Honor* is in the temporal order what virtue is in the spiritual order. If circumstances make it impractical to be virtuous, man must strive to win *honor*.

The argument is intelligible, but is it Christian? This is the problem that disturbed Lope and his contemporaries. It was a problem that might be ignored in secular literature without detriment to artistic truth. But in the *auto sacramental*—an expression of Christian truth—it was necessary to take sides.

In his *autos* Lope takes the view that *honor* is not compatible with Christianity. Divine forgiveness has banished the need for the *honor* sentiment:

. . . donde Dios perdona
ninguna virtud se agravia.¹³

Christ, when he descended to this earth, rejected *honor*. El Sosiego says to La Honra:

Dios
descalzo en el mundo anduvo,
que nunca por buena os tuvo.¹⁴

¹¹ In this respect their analysis is at one with Saint Thomas'. After distinguishing between the "things of this world" and "spiritual goods," Saint Thomas lists "external wealth," "carnal pleasures," and "honors" as "the goods of this world." *Summa Theologica*, I-II, Q. cviii, art. iv.

¹² Castro, *art. cit.*, 40.

¹³ *La locura por la honra*, II, 643. All quotations from Lope are taken from the Academia Española edition of the *Obras*, ed. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, Madrid, 1892, II, and 1893, III.

¹⁴ II, 640.

Man, too, should reject *honor* since by the light of reason *honor* is not good for him. *Honor* deprives him of peace of mind:

Que si yo soy el Sosiego,
¿cómo me puedo casar
con Honra del mundo ciego,
ni vivir en paz, ni estar
juntos el hielo y el fuego?¹⁵

Honor is fleeting, vain and unreal. It does not exist in itself, but only in the imagination of others:

Honra, ¿tú ves que dura
poco tiempo tu placer,
y que toda tu locura
viene después a tener
su fin en la sepultura?
¿Para qué vives hinchada,
haciendo descortesías,
malquista de gente honrada,
pues cuanto alcanzar porffías
viene a resolverse en nada?
¿Quieres ver, Honra, quien eres,
que estás en otro, no en ti,
pues la adoración que quieres
te han de dar otros?¹⁶

The revenge that *honor* demands is crazy. So Lope places La Venganza among the madmen in El Mundo's madhouse:

HOMBRE. ¿Quién es aquél tan furioso?
MUNDO. ¿Este? No hay hombre que duerma,
ni coma, y aunque le atemos
de mil cadenas, se suelta;
es la Venganza del mundo,
que anda por montes y cuevas,
tanto que en los ignorantes
de los culpados se venga.¹⁷

In another play La Honra del Mundo is in the same madhouse. He says to El Mundo, his warden:

Porque en vanidad me fundo
en vuestra cárcel estoy.¹⁸

¹⁵ II, 639.

¹⁶ II, 639-40.

¹⁷ *Dos ingenios y esclavos del Santísimo Sacramento*, III, 7.

¹⁸ *La locura por la honra*, II, 639.

Honor is thus roundly condemned by Lope, the sacramental dramatist. But, just as Lope's sacramental plays sometimes are unable to rid themselves of the conventions of the secular stage, so in this matter of *honor* the poet is aware that the spiritual fact that *honor* does not exist is not the whole story. The worldly fact that *honor* does exist cannot always be ignored. So in a passage quoted above, *La Honra* is paradoxically assailed for being "mal-quista de gente honrada." Lope can never completely abandon the idea that there is some good in *honor*. He therefore distinguishes between *la honra del mundo* and *la honra de Dios*:

. . . las honras del mundo
son viento, son polvo y nada,
y sólo hay honra de Dios.¹⁹

La honra del mundo may be mad, but never foolish:

A lo menos, no soy necia
como eres tú, Confianza.²⁰

What corresponds to a social reality cannot be regarded as silly by Lope, for, like the casuists, he was a man of the world. *El Honor* accordingly is presented—along with such respectable figures as *El Cuidado* and *La Discreción*—as one of the servants of *El Alma*.²¹ Nevertheless he is relieved when, in fulfilment of a promise made by *El Alma* to *El Príncipe de la Paz*, his nature and character are changed to those of *El Desprecio*:

No habrá cosa en cuanto tiene,
señora, que no aborrezca;
que el conservar este nombre
sabe Dios lo que me cuesta.
No quiero ser más Honor,
ni andar en manos ajenas.²²

Lope, to sum up, sees *honor* as empty, unsubstantial and illusory, as unnecessary in a Christian world. But try as he may, he cannot suppress an unwilling esteem for the reality of *honor* in everyday life. In the *autos* he is as undecided about the final solution of

¹⁹ II, 637.

²⁰ II, 639.

²¹ *El Príncipe de la Paz*, III, 133-147. It is possible that this play is by Mira de Amescua. Cf. p. xvii.

²² III, 135.

the *honor* problem as he is in the secular plays. But whereas in these latter he accepts the theme with critical reservations, in the *autos* he rejects the theme with similar critical reservations.

Valdivielso dispenses with the reservations. His analysis of *honor* is otherwise not unlike Lope's. The code for him is un-Christian. Truth, when faced with danger, is not ashamed to flee. El Honor is furious at such cowardice and calls him a "sufre-agravios."²³ Christ (El Esposo in *La serrana de Plasencia*) is also a "sufre-agravios":

amor
es gran sufridor de ofensas.²⁴

La Inocencia, in *La amistad en el peligro*, also approves the principle of flight from evil:

Huye deste mal tremendo;
huye si quieres vencer;
que la Culpa y la mujer
se vencen mejor huyendo.²⁵

Honor is un-Christian in its rejection of penitence and forgiveness. When the sinful Serrana contemplates returning to her wronged husband, El Engaño says:

¿En tal pensaste?
Si la honra le quitaste,
¿dejaráte con la vida?
Teme, pues, si no eres loca,
en tan honrados enojos,
los puñales de sus ojos,
los venenos de su boca.²⁶

Similarly the Pilgrim, in *El peregrino*, has to choose between the Inn of Honor and the Cave of Penitence.

Not only does Valdivielso see *honor* as un-Christian, but also as an illusory and false concept. El Engaño says:

Engaño es el Honor, tía,
aunque él engaña en un día
más necios que yo en un año.²⁷

²³ *El peregrino*, 208. All quotations from Valdivielso are taken from BAE, LVII.

²⁴ *La serrana de Plasencia*, 249.

²⁵ *La amistad en el peligro*, 234.

²⁶ *La serrana de Plasencia*, 247.

²⁷ P. 247-8.

In *El peregrino* El Honor has three servants: they are La Lisonja, La Doblez and El Engaño. La Verdad punctures the lies of *honor* when, as the landlord of an inn, El Honor tries to persuade El Peregrino to stay. The rich apartments, says La Verdad, are emptier than a ball; the comfortable chairs give no rest; the bed is a bed of wind, and a torture rack into the bargain. El Honor cannot give enough to all; to give to some he must take from others,

y es porque no hay para todos.²⁸

In Valdivielso Truth and Honor are implacable enemies, and where Honor reigns, Truth is banished:

LUZBEL. La Verdad,
esa loca deslenguada,
de palacio desterrada,
de la corte y la ciudad.²⁹

Like Lope, Valdivielso speaks of *honor* as vain and unreasonable. El Honor, in *La serrana de Plasencia*, rejects the proffered greeting of El Engaño:

Guárdeos Dios un labrador
a un hombre de mi jaez,
es no estimarme.³⁰

Underlying this incident is the suggestion that those who reject the greeting of *Guárdeos Dios* are not only being unreasonable, but also un-Christian.

Honor, too, is unreal. When El Peregrino is offered food at the house of La Hermosura, the steward Mendacio brings in a dish which contains "un pájaro que vuela."³¹ This dish is identified by La Verdad as "de honra y dignidad." And when Valdivielso lists the maids-of-honor in La Lascivia's train, he uses these words:

Dina, Bersabé y Tamar,
de honor (sin tenerle) dueñas.³²

Honor, that is to say, is often a mere matter of nomenclature. If a person is called honorable, he is honorable; but calling him so does not affect the reality of things. *Honor* is associated with positions of authority. "Junto a la venta del Honor, un árbol de

²⁸ *El peregrino*, 207-8.

²⁹ P. 205.

³⁰ P. 247.

³¹ *El peregrino*, 210.

³² *El hijo pródigo*, 219.

cuyas ramas penden tiaras, coronas y otros símbolos de autoridad."³³
 But authority is as vain as Eve, whose tree in the Garden of Eden is suggested by this symbolical tree:

INVIDIA. Los reinos del mundo
 yo soy quien los manda;
 sus sillas y cetros
 te daré si callas.

INOCENCIA. No quiero sus glorias,
 que en figura pasan,
 y al fin sé que son
 humo, sombra, nada.³⁴

Valdivielso agrees with Lope, then, in judging *honor* to be false, unreal and un-Christian. But, unlike Lope, he is not tempted to make room in his scheme of things for worldly *honor*. Lope seems to say that *honor* is unreal by eternal standards, but real by everyday standards. He cannot suppress the idea of valid worldly *honor* from his allegories. He has tried, as an author of Christian plays, to convince himself that *honor* does not exist. But because he lives in the world, everyday experience contradicts the position he adopts. The futile attempt to reconcile the spiritual and the worldly is a symptom of Lope's inability to write satisfactory *autos sacramentales*. Valdivielso, on the other hand, did not live in the world to the extent that Lope did. His remoteness from the world enabled him to forego the casuistic compromise. He was first a priest and then a dramatist. He composed only *autos* and *comedias divinas*. The dual standard—*bienes espirituales*, *bienes temporales*—was not forced upon him. He could see only one side of the question. But the side he saw was the only one a sacramental dramatist had a right to see.

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

The Johns Hopkins University

DRYDEN'S LETTER TO "ORMOND"

In the *Illustrated London News* (Aug. 28, 1858, p. 197) this announcement can be read:

By the kindness of a well-wisher we are this week enabled to publish, and for the first time, the recently-discovered letter from Dryden to the Duke of Ormond, of the Rebellion of 1715. It is a kind of begging-letter in the true Dryden manner.

³³ *El peregrino*, 205.

³⁴ *La amistad en el peligro*, 237.

The letter is dated "The first day of Winter, 1698," and begins "May it please yr Grace." It was printed in Saintsbury's revision of Scott's edition, not along with Dryden's other letters, but among "Additions and Corrections" (xviii (1893), 320)—a treatment that Saintsbury justified by stating in a preliminary note that he did not "know its authentication." He ascribed the publication to Peter Cunningham, hinting, it seems, that this made it suspect. He too gave the Duke of Ormond as the addressee. Mr. Hugh Macdonald in his *Dryden Bibliography* (1939, p. 186) mentioned the letter "to the Duke of Ormonde"¹ as published first by Peter Cunningham and then by Saintsbury, but he offered no comment. Mr. Charles E. Ward, in his collected edition (1942) of Dryden letters,² gave the letter (no. 56) as printed in the *Illustrated London News* and added, "I have no doubt that it is genuine," but he did not state his reasons. I too think the letter genuine, but for a reason that Mr. C. E. Ward certainly never saw.

The letter first praises the addressee for beauty, then for being a "Plantagenet." Now the Duke of Ormond was not, so far as I can discover, conspicuous for his good looks, nor are they mentioned in the *Dedication* to him of Dryden's *Fables*. He was, indeed, descended from Eleanor de Bohun, a granddaughter of Edward I, but this remote maternal ancestry could hardly make of him a "Plantagenet."³

I suggest that the letter is addressed to the Duchess of Ormond and stands in close relation to Dryden's verse dedication to her of *Palamon and Arcite*, in which "Illustrious Ormond" (l. 7) is first likened to Chaucer's patroness:

¹ The index does not distinguish between the first and the second Duke.

² Ditto for the index. This useful edition came out at a time when I could not review it. Is it too late to point out that the isle of "Rhé" does not lie in or near the Low Countries (note 3 to letter 4)? This geographical error plays havoc with Dryden's remark that the second Duke of Buckingham "still picques himself, like his father, to find another Isle of Rhé in Zealand," i.e. meet such success on some isle in Zealand as his father did in the isle west of Rochelle. Cf. Corneille's *Nicomède* saying:

Et si Flaminius en est le capitaine,
Nous saurons lui trouver un lac de Trasimène

somewhere in Asia Minor.

³ See *DNB* under Butler, James, second Earl of Ormond (1331-1382), son to the said Eleanor.

The fairest Nymph before his Eyes he set;
And then the fairest was *Plantagenet*.⁴

Then the Duchess of Ormond, née Lady Mary Somerset and daughter of the first Duke of Beaufort, descended in the male line from John of Gaunt, is directly hailed thus:

O true *Plantagenet*, O Race Divine,
For Beauty still is fatal to the Line.⁵

But the most graceful compliment of all is held in reserve for the peroration:

O Daughter of the Rose, whose Cheeks unite
The diff'ring titles of the Red and White.⁶

We can draw the parallel closer between the letter and the poem. The former begins:

What Ireland was before yr coming Thither I cannot tell, but I am sure you have brought over one manufacture thither wch is not of ye growth of the country, and that is beauty. But at the same time, you have impoverished yr Native Land by taking more away yn you have left behind.

Compare:

When Westward, like the Sun, you took your Way,
And from benighted *Britain* bore the day.⁷

The only difference is that Dryden wrote the letter while the Duchess was in Ireland, the poem after she came back to England. Luttrell⁸ informs us that the Duchess went to Ireland in April, 1697. She had been there for some twenty months when the letter was written, a fact that agrees with a remark in it about the King's "going over the water for a whole Summer together and . . . yr Graces leaving us for a much longer time." William III had left England for Holland on July 8, 1698, and had returned on the 5th or 6th December. The Duchess returned from Ireland some time in 1699, fell dangerously ill and was still convalescent (ll. 101-

⁴ Lines 13, 14. Whether Dryden means the Duchess Blanche or the Fair Maid of Kent does not concern us here.

⁵ Lines 30, 31.

⁶ Lines 151, 152.

⁷ Lines 41, 42.

⁸ *Brief Relation*, 1857, iv, 214, quoted by Noyes in his note to line 62 of the poem.

106) when the dedication was written, not later than October.⁹ Ten months at most elapsed between the letter and the poem.

Lastly, in fairness to Dryden we must remark that the letter is not what the *Illustrated London News* called it, "a kind of begging-letter." It expresses thanks for a gift received: "The product o[f] Ireland will . . . serve to warm my Body as it does this Winter by yr Graces favour to me." We are left to guess the nature of the gift. Some today will think of whisky; others, of homespun, which seems nearer the mark, if we remember "the progress of the woollen manufactures in Ireland that had lately excited even more alarm and indignation [in England] than the contraband trade with France." Indeed "an Act of the English Parliament which laid severe restrictions on the exportation of woollen goods from Ireland" had, "early in the year 1698," called for William Molyneux's resounding protest, *The Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated*.¹⁰ Maybe the Duchess's gift was all the more valuable for being illegal or at least made just before the legal prohibition came into force.¹¹ The

⁹ See letters 65 (note 2) and 67 in Ward's edition.

¹⁰ See Macaulay, *History of England*, Chap. XXIII and *DNB* under Molyneux, William.

¹¹ Speaking of garments; near the end of the verse-dedication Dryden, praising the behaviour of the Duchess when the Duke is away, says:

For him Your envious Needle paints the Flow'rs;
Such works of Old Imperial Dames were taught,
Such for *Ascanius*, fair *Elisa* wrought. (ll. 160-2)

No commentator seems to have noticed that Dido wrought "such works" not for Ascanius but for Æneas, of whom Virgil tells us:

Tyrioque ardebat murice laena
demissa ex umeris, diues quae munera Dido
fecerat et tenui telas discreuerat auro. (iv, 262-4)

A later passage is even more explicit about Dido's authorship of the "works":

Tum geminas uestis auroque ostroque rigentis
extulit Æneas, quas illi laeta laborum
ipsa suis quondam manibus Sidonia Dido
fecerat et tenui telas discreuerat auro. (xi, 72-5)

True, Dido *did* make gifts to Ascanius, but they consisted of a Sidonian horse (v, 570-2) and an ancient bowl (ix, 266). On the other hand Cupid,

only thing the letter does beg for is the Duchess's "returne next Spring with the first Swallow" because "I cannot beare to be cold at heart and the colder I am the more need I have of the Sun to comfort me." Of such begging we need not be ashamed for Dryden.

I conclude that the letter is genuine because, if Peter Cunningham or his anonymous well-wisher had forged it, they would have addressed it properly and described its contents accurately. They just misread the address: *his* for *her* and *Duke* for *Duchess*, probably because they knew something of the former, but nothing of the latter. What strikes me as more remarkable is the persistence of the error once made. Indeed, were not the times so uncertain, not to speak of human life in general, it might have been worth while to wait a few years longer and kill this error, as Guanhumara intended to have Job killed in Hugo's *Burgraves*, on its centenary.

PIERRE LEGOUTS

Lyon, France

assuming the form of Ascanius, brought gifts from Æneas to Dido, including

pallam signis auroque rigentem
et circumtextum croceo ualamen acantho. (I, 648-9)

And Ascanius *did* indeed receive as gifts the "works" of an "Imperial Dame," only her name was not Dido but Andromache (III, 483-7). Dryden's translation had been published in the summer of the preceding year. From all these passages a confused notion seems to have arisen in his head that Dido's fair hands worked for Ascanius. Shall we leave it at that, or examine his slip, calling it a *Fehlleistung*, in the light of psychoanalysis? Virgil himself had shown that Ascanius was used by Dido as a substitute for his father and a sop to her repressed, unspeakable passion:

gremio Ascanium genitoris imagine capta
detinet, infandum si fallere possit amorem. (IV, 84-5)

She tried, vainly, to operate a transfer (suggested by M. Louis Martin, once a classicist, now a student of mine, who has collected for me all the above-quoted passages from the *Æneid* except the first). But what about Dryden? Might he not unconsciously substitute himself for the Duke? Alas! there is no hint in the letter that the fair hands of the Duchess had done any work on her gift to the poet, and I think too well of his sense to imagine him, at sixty-seven, disguising as the youthful Ascanius, even in his dreams.

THE DÉNOUEMENT OF MÉRIMÉE'S *LA CHAMBRE BLEUE*

One of the last of Mérimée's works, *La Chambre bleue* (1866), has remained in the shadows cast by the brilliant light of such tales as *Tamango* and *Mateo Falcone*. Briefly, the plot is this: two lovers arrange to spend the night in a hotel in a suburb of Paris. They meet at the railway station, and on the way, share their compartment with a wealthy Englishman. On arrival, the Englishman is approached by an unkempt man who addresses him in English, and who is revealed to be his indigent nephew. The Englishman dismisses him contemptuously, after giving him money. Installed in the "blue room," the lovers are harassed by a party of drunken officers next door. The Englishman, who has taken the other adjoining room, orders a bottle of port and settles down for an evening's drinking. Looking through his window before retiring, the young man thinks he sees the prowling figure of the nephew. Finally the hotel becomes quiet. After some time, however, the young man awakens to hear a dull thud in the Englishman's room, and the sound of footsteps in the corridor. He is then horrified to perceive a trickle of liquid running from beneath the door which connects the two rooms. He awakens his sweetheart, and after consultation, they decide to leave on the early morning train. Next morning, pale with fear, they are about to depart, when the *femme de chambre* bursts in with the news that the Englishman had overturned his bottle of port onto the floor.

Pierre Trahard finds little artistic merit in *La Chambre bleue*, largely because of the author's "gravité de pince-sans-rire" and what he calls the "volte-face" of the dénouement.¹ This criticism by an authority on Mérimée seems to be based on a misunderstanding-

¹ *La Vieillesse de Prosper Mérimée*, Paris, Champion, 1939, p. 224. Augustin Filon inferred from Mérimée's comment that the reversal would apply only to the incident of the spilled wine, so that if the lovers thought they saw blood, the ending would be humorous, with the blood revealed as wine; by the reverse situation, they would take the liquid for Port Wine, only to discover later that it was blood. But Mérimée was not concerned merely with this incident, which he had actually treated according to his prescription, but with a contrast between the dénouement and the tone of the story from the beginning.—Cf. *Œuvres complètes: Dernières Nouvelles*, ed. L. Lemonnier, Champion, 1929, pp. x-xi.

ing both of the story itself, and of a statement concerning it made by the author and quoted in an article by O. d'Haussonville:

Il y a cependant un grand défaut, qui tient à ce que j'ai changé le dénouement; je comptais d'abord donner à mon récit un dénouement tragique, et *naturellement* j'avais raconté l'histoire sur un ton plaisant; puis j'ai changé d'idée et j'ai terminé par un dénouement plaisant. Il aurait fallu recommencer et raconter l'histoire sur un ton tragique; mais cela m'a ennuyé, et je l'ai laissée là.²

Now Trahard's comment on this is interesting. Of Mérimée's last years, he writes:

Visiblement, il se fatigue. Lui-même raconte comment, après avoir conçu *la Chambre bleue* sur le mode tragique, il changea de dénouement, mais n'eut pas le courage de refaire le récit de façon à le mettre en harmonie avec le dénouement nouveau: d'où un manque d'équilibre qui saute aux yeux.³

Not only does Trahard imply here that the story has a tragic atmosphere throughout, only to end humorously, but he takes Mérimée's remark about his failure to rework the story as proof that the story lacks balance. Actually nothing could be further from Mérimée's meaning. He had expected to give his story a tragic end, he says, and *naturally* he presented it in a humorous tone. *Naturally*, because at this point in his creative development he was striving for an effect of shock, both to reader and established literary convention. This shock, in the case of *La Chambre bleue*, was to have been obtained by gently amusing the reader, as it were nudging him in the ribs at the ludicrous antics of the lovers, and then, without warning, implicating them in a horrible murder. What Mérimée meant concerning the revision was simply that once he had given the story a humorous ending, then according to his paradoxical theory, he ought to have gone back and written it in a lugubrious vein. Conversely, if the story had been told in ominous tones suggesting impending doom, the Mériméan dénouement would have been frivolous or ludicrous. Such abrupt reversals occur in the other two stories of the last period, *Lokis* (1869), and *Djâmane* (1869). The first ends with the sudden revelation of the bride's murder, in contrast to the author's skeptical tone concerning the strange event on which the story is based, and his sympathetic presentation of the main character. In the second, a

² *RdDM*, xxxiv³ (1879), 771.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 225.

series of romantic episodes turn out to have been only a dream of the young lieutenant, and the face of the beautiful girl is replaced by the mustachioed countenance of the sergeant-major. This method does not imply, as d'Haussonville suggested, a constant shuttling between fear and amusement, an alternatively ominous or jocular attitude. Mérimée's early insouciance with regard to his dénouements, exemplified in *La Partie de Trictrac* (1830), and *Carmen* (1845), had simply developed into a deliberately calculated attempt to mislead his reader as to the outcome.

This theory, which he had so little time to put into practice, seems to be a tardy development of Mérimée's cynicism toward the novelist's art. A similar attitude is evident in the work of a Diderot or a Sterne, and stems from the eighteenth-century's critical awareness of the essential faults in existing novelistic conventions.⁴ Mérimée's comment is important as a confirmation of his disdain for prevailing literary modes.

Quite obviously then, Trahard's judgment that the story has a glaring lack of balance is incorrect, at least insofar as it is based on Mérimée's statement, since the writer's self-criticism was due precisely to the fact that he had yielded, giving his story the traditional balance. But a glance at the story itself reveals, moreover, that it is closely knit, and that the conclusion is an integral part of the fabric. The bantering tone is maintained throughout, beginning with the description of the young lovers' meeting at the railway station. The young man has disguised himself in blue spectacles, and keeps covering his face with his handkerchief, despite the fact, Mérimée adds slyly, that he did not have a cold. Each carries a traveling-bag, and Mérimée carefully notes that he only learned *later* what each one contained: the young man's a silk dressing-gown and pajamas, the lady's a beautiful dressing-gown and blue satin mules. This detail seems aimed at the Realists, who would probably not have permitted, in a purely visual description, the revelation of the contents of the traveling-bags. Both possible literary approaches, the Romantic and the Realistic, are held up to ridicule. The author points out the actual banality of the escapade, despite its Romantic possibilities,

⁴ Diderot wrote *Les Deux amis de Bourbonne* primarily to refute the suggestion in Saint-Lambert's *Deux amis Iroquois* that undying friendships could exist only in primitive surroundings. See James Doolittle, "Criticism as Creation in the Work of Diderot," *YFS*, II¹ (1949), 14-23.

by showing us the automatism of the lovers' conversation—when they meet, each cries "Quel bonheur!" and later, in their fear, they fall into each other's arms, sobbing "Pardonne-moi!"—by a resigned parenthesis: "J'ai oublié de dire qu'elle était jeune et jolie," or by the ironic brevity with which he explains their relationship:

Peut-être ne surprendrai-je pas mes lecteurs en leur disant que c'étaient des amants dans toute la force du terme, et, ce qu'il y avait de déplorable, c'est qu'ils n'étaient pas mariés, et il y avait des raisons qui s'opposaient à ce qu'ils le fussent.

At the horrible thought of the dead body next door, the lovers fall into each other's arms, each anxious to take the blame for the mishap: "et comme ils n'étaient pas sûrs qu'on leur permît de s'embrasser encore sur l'échafaud, ils s'embrassèrent à s'étouffer, s'arrosant à l'envi de leurs larmes." When Léon has decided to leave the inn, Mérimée in a digression aimed at the Romantic conception of the hero, gives logical reasons why the young man resolved to take to his heels despite the undoubted censure of "la plupart de mes lecteurs et surtout mes lectrices": "Il aurait dû, me dirait-on, courir à la chambre de l'Anglais et arrêter le meurtrier, tout au moins tirer sa sonnette et carillonner les gens de l'hôtel." First of all, he remarks gravely, it is notorious that the bell-cords in French hotel rooms never work. Moreover, is it not better to save one's beloved from the scandal that would surely result if their presence were revealed by an alarm? But yet what a dilemma! "Vaut-il mieux laisser égorger un voyageur inconnu ou déshonorer et perdre la femme qu'on aime?" He adds archly, "J'en donne en dix la solution au plus habile."

Mérimée spoofs the Realistic reliance on physiognomy in his description of the nephew: "Il était pâle, jaune même, les yeux creux et injectés de sang, la barbe mal faite, *signe auquel on reconnaît souvent les grands criminels*" (italics mine). Realism is further satirized by a specific reference to *Madame Bovary*. It is no coincidence that he christens his hero Léon, for the latter rationalizes thus the presence of his noisy neighbors:

Du côté de l'Anglais il y avait double porte; les murs étaient épais. Du côté des hussards la paroi était plus mince, mais la porte avait serrure et verrou. Après tout, c'était contre la curiosité une barrière bien plus efficace que les stores d'une voiture, et combien de gens se croient isolés du monde dans un fiacre!

Thus the satirical tone of the story derives both from Mérimée's ridicule of the characters, and his flouting of the literary conventions which might be followed in its telling. He consistently points to the attitudinizing of the lovers: their disguise and their foolish belief in its efficacy, the wild imagination that makes them think each step in the corridor is that of the imperial prosecutor and assume that they will be imprisoned and hanged for the crime. The humorous ending, which leaves them limp with laughter at their own foolishness, is a logical development of the rest of the story, which illustrates so well the comical aspects of Romantic love.

Finally, the story provides evidence that Mérimée's ending was no last minute decision. An important clue paves the way for the burlesque dénouement. When the Englishman orders port, the waitress tells him there is none in the hotel. The innkeeper scolds her, and proceeds to concoct a synthetic port of cheap wine, cognac, and *ratafia*, a sweet liqueur made of fruit and various spices which almost invariably contains vanilla.⁵ At a tense moment in the story, Léon watches what he assumes to be blood flow out from under the Englishman's door and slowly reach one of his sweetheart's blue satin slippers lying in its path. Later, as they pack, the young woman tries to burn the stained slipper, but, "Léon la ramassa, et après l'avoir essuyée à la descente de lit, il la baisa et la mit dans sa poche. Il fut surpris de trouver qu'elle sentait la vanille; son amie avait pour parfum le bouquet de l'impératrice Eugénie."

Thus the dénouement, which from Mérimée's remark one might infer had been hastily tacked on, had not only been carefully prepared for by the satirical tone of the rest of the story, but also by a skillfully placed clue. We must be grateful that Mérimée did not make his final gesture of scorn for literary tradition, for despite his creative cynicism, and despite M. Trahard, *La Chambre bleue* remains a delightfully humorous mystery story, in which, with all the fair play we demand of detective story writers, the author presents his readers with all the clues!

JOHN C. LAPP

Oberlin College

⁵ See *La Grande Encyclopédie*, Paris, s.d., XXVIII, 166-167. Henri Martineau missed the allusion, apparently thinking *ratafia* was rum! (*Contes et Nouvelles de P. Mérimée*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1934, p. 847, n. 7).

THE PSEUDONYM OF ISIDORE DUCASSE

During the last fifteen years the author of the *Chants de Maldoror* has been admitted (albeit somewhat grudgingly) to the Pantheon of Literary History.¹ His pretentious pseudonym, "Comte de Lautréamont," has been universally accepted by scholars, bibliographers and even library cataloguers—reluctant though these last are to accept a pseudonym in place of an author's real name—and it will probably stick. This is a rather odd fact, for as this paper aims to demonstrate, it is by no means certain that the pseudonym "Lautréamont" is authentic.

In his lifetime Ducasse published two works, one, the first *chant* of the *Chants de Maldoror*, in 1868, without any author's name, and the other, the brochure entitled *Poésies*, in 1870, "par Isidore Ducasse." The complete edition of the *Chants de Maldoror* appeared in Brussels in 1874, four years after the author's death. "Par le Comte de Lautréamont" appeared on the title page. The few letters of Ducasse that have been published² show that this edition was printed as early as 1869, but that the publishers, Lacroix and Verbroeckhoven, fearing the censors, refused to issue it. At least one copy,³ and maybe more, of the *Chants de Maldoror*, "par le Comte de Lautréamont," bearing the date 1869 on the title page, is in existence.

Most of our uncertainty as to the authenticity of the pseudonym "Lautréamont," any suspicion that the name "Lautréamont" may have been a contribution of the publisher Lacroix, any theory that the spelling "Lautréamont" is the result of a proofreader's mistake that the author would certainly have corrected, would have to be abandoned if we were certain that Ducasse had ever had the opportunity of casting his eye on that 1896 title page. The

¹ In my article "The Problem of Lautréamont" (*Romanic Review* xxv, 140-50, 1934), I pointed out that, except for a brief article by S. A. Rhodes (*Romanic Review* xxii, 285-90, 1931), the name of Lautréamont had never been mentioned, even in a bibliography, in any French, British or American review devoted to French literary history. Since that date things have changed.

² See Isidore Ducasse, Comte de Lautréamont, *Oeuvres complètes* (Edition du Centenaire), Paris, Charlot, 1946, pp. 389-96.

³ In the Jacques Doucet Collection in the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève.

evidence of his letters is negative. It is true that in a letter of October 1869, he asked the publisher Verbroeckhoven to send him 20 copies.⁴ Can we assume that he received them, with the 1869 title page, and the name, spelled "Comte de Lautréamont" as in the copy in the Jacques Doucet Collection?⁵ It is possible, but not certain. There is no mention, in the correspondence, of his having received the copies, and there is no mention of a pseudonym.

We have then these facts: On the title page of an edition printed during the author's lifetime, but actually published four years after his death, he is called "Comte de Lautréamont." Strangely enough, no one has pointed out the possibility (though it should be obvious) that the spelling "Lautréamont" might very well be the result of a typographical error. Over twenty years ago, Philippe Soupault, editor of the complete works of Ducasse, seems to have been the first one to suggest that the pseudonym came from a novel by Eugène Sue.⁶ But the novel by Sue, entitled after its hero, is *Latréaumont*, not *Lautréamont*. It would not be difficult to find reasons why Ducasse might have chosen to call himself "Comte de Latréaumont." Sue gave to the hero of his novel—a minor Norman nobleman, who was involved in the Rohan conspiracy in 1674 and was mortally wounded while resisting arrest, after the conspiracy was discovered—a character that has numerous analogies to that of Ducasse's Maldoror.⁷ Latréaumont, like Maldoror, is physically a sort of superman, a man of prodigious bodily strength and skill. Like Maldoror, he had originally been noble and idealistic, but having been disillusioned early in life, he had become cynical, debauched, cruel, infernally proud, and, above all, an impious blasphemer. Ducasse, who devoted a large part of his work to vituperation of God and to descriptions of Maldoror's bitter struggles against the Creator, must have admired the death of Latréaumont, who mocked the priest come to confess him, and died with scornful laughter on his lips, after having managed to sing the last lines of a cynical and defiant song:

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 393.

⁵ Miss Jacqueline Ragner, of the University of Iowa, very kindly verified for me the fact that the spelling on the 1869 title page is "Lautréamont."

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 28. In the edition of the *Oeuvres complètes* edited by Soupault in 1927 (Paris, Au Sans Pareil), this was already stated (p. 33).

⁷ He was a real person. (See Ravaissou, *Archives de la Bastille*, VII, 407-09). His complete name was "Jules Duhamel, seigneur de la Tréaumont." The name comes from the village of La Tréaumont, near Rouen.

Evitant une mort infame,
 Il fourba même le bourreau,
 Il fourba le diable en ce point:
 Qu'il croyait emporter son âme,
 Mais l'affronteur n'en avait point.*

There would, therefore, be nothing surprising, if Ducasse had picked the pseudonym "Comte de Latréaumont." But why change it to "Lautréaumont?" The hypothesis of a typographical error, perpetuated by generations who had forgotten Sue's minor works, seems the most reasonable.⁹

After half a century of unjust neglect, the greatness of Isidore Ducasse, author of the *Chants de Maldoror*, is now realized, but by an ironic stroke of fate, he is chiefly known now and presumably will be known to posterity by a name that is quite possibly the product of a typographical error.

HENRY A. GRUBBS

Oberlin College

EDOUARD ESTAUNIÉ, CRITIC AND REVIEWER

From July 18, 1888 to October 3, 1889, Edouard Estaunié contributed thirty-nine articles to the *Gazette Diplomatique*. The only previous mention of these by a student of Estaunié's work was made by Camille Cé. It is not likely that he had read them. Cé wrote: "Emballé par l'*Envers d'une Sainte* de François de Curel alors très discuté, il écrit dessus six feuillets. C'était en 1892. . . . Le jeune écrivain (il avait alors trente ans) qui venait d'écrire *Un Simple* continue sa critique littéraire dans la *Gazette* jusqu'au jour . . . où la *Gazette Diplomatique* s'écroula."¹

One could hardly have made more mistakes in so few lines. The *Gazette* suspended publication in December 1889; Estaunié's last article had appeared the month before. None of his con-

* Eugène Sue, *Latréaumont*, Paris, Flammarion, n. d. (first edition 1838), p. 339.

* A curious parallel case, and this time surely a typographical error, is found in a letter of Balzac to Mme Hanska, where he mentions Sue's novel. The Calmann-Lévy edition of *Lettres à l'Etrangère* (Paris, n. d., I, 458) gives the spelling "Lautréaumont."

¹ Camille Cé, *Regards sur l'œuvre d'Edouard Estaunié* (Perrin, 1935), p. 30.

tributions to the paper concerns Curel. Estaunié published *Un Simple* in 1891. Several articles on Curel (though not *six* on *L'Envers d'une Sainte*) did appear in 1899-1900, but in the *Mémorial Diplomatique*, which was in no way connected with the *Gazette*. The coincidental similarity of the names of the two papers may account for some of the confusion.

Estaunié contributed nineteen articles to the *Mémorial* from May 14, 1899 to October 28, 1900.² Thus there is a total of fifty-eight articles by the novelist which have hitherto received no attention from critics or scholars. Their existence should dispel the generally held notion that Estaunié had never done any journalism. They deserve to be dusted off and examined in detail for many of them are on topics of lasting interest, and those that are not, the reviewer's choice being limited to what appears in print or on the stage at a given time, are well worth reading for their good sense and gentle irony.

Of particular interest to specialists, in the *Gazette*, are: *L'Aventurière* (Augier), August 1, 1888; *Le Théâtre naturaliste*, September 5, 1888; *Crime et Châtiment*, drame en 7 tableaux d'après le roman de M. Dostoievsky, par MM. Paul Ginisty et Hughes Le Roux, September 19, 1888; *Le Théâtre bien fait*, September 26, 1888; *Sur l'eau* (Maupassant), October 24, 1888; *Le Rêve* (Zola), *Préfaces et Manifestes littéraires* (Goncourt), October 31, 1888; *La Fin d'un Monde* (Ed. Drumont), December 13, 1888; *Le Sens de la vie* (Rod), February 14, 1889; *Un homme libre* (Barrès), May 23, 1889; *Le Disciple* (Bourget), July 11, 1889; *Fort comme la mort* (Maupassant), July 18, 1889; *Le Chant du Cygne* (Tolstoi), August 15, 1889.

Of the reviews and articles in the *Mémorial*, the following may be of interest: a critical essay in four parts on Curel, June 25,

² No mention of these is found in works devoted to Estaunié. My attention was called to them by Léon Guichard's *L'Oeuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard* (Nizet et Bastard, 1935) in which the writer praises Estaunié's review of *Poils de Carotte*.

That both sets of articles should have escaped notice is not surprising for both papers were obscure; concerned with finance and international politics, their literary column was not likely to attract the attention of the literati. Though he was a reviewer over a spread of four years, Estaunié's name never figured among those in the list of critics and reviewers published annually in Stoulig's *Les Annales du théâtre et de la musique*.

August 13, 27, September 3, 1899, and a review of *Les Fossiles*, May 27, 1900; *Le Torrent* (Donnay), June 4, 1889 and *La Clairière*, Lucien Descaves and Maurice Donnay; three reviews concerning Antoine, July 23, November 19, 1899, January 21, 1900; *L'Empreinte*,³ Abel Hermant, *Poil de Carotte*, Jules Renard; two pieces on Augier, October 22, 1899, February 11, 1900; *L'Enchantement*, Bataille, May 27, 1900; *Charlotte Corday*, Ponsard, May 6, 1900; *Diane de Lys*, Dumas fils, March 11, 1900; *La Gitane*, Richepin, February 11, 1900.

EDWARD HARVEY

Kenyon College

A SOURCE FOR WORDSWORTH'S SONNET, "THE BLACK STONES OF IONA"

To the sonnet, "The Black Stones of Iona," Wordsworth appends the following note: "See Martin's *Voyage among the Western Isles*." The passage to which Wordsworth refers must be the following:

A little further to the west lie the black stones, which are so called, not from their colour, for that is grey, but from the effects that tradition say ensued upon perjury, if any one became guilty of it after swearing on these stones in the usual manner; for an oath made on them was decisive in all controversies. . . . Hence it is that when one was certain of what he affirmed, he said positively, I have freedom to swear this matter upon the black stones.¹

This passage helps to clarify the following lines in Wordsworth's sonnet:

Here on their knees men swore: the stones were black,
Black in the people's minds and word, yet they
Were at that time, as now, in colour grey.
But what is colour, if upon the rack
Of conscience souls are placed by deeds that lack
Concord with oaths? What differ night and day
Then, when before the Perjured on his way
Hell opens, and the heavens in vengeance crack . . .

CHARLES NORTON COE

University of Idaho

³ No connection with the novel of the same title by Estaunié.

¹ Martin Martin, *A description of the Western islands of Scotland, circa 1695*. London, 1703, pp. 259-260.

REVIEWS

John Milton's Complete Poetical Works. Reproduced in Photographic Facsimile. A Critical Text Edition Compiled and Edited by HARRIS FRANCIS FLETCHER. Volumes III-IV. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1948. Pp. 455 and 316. \$20 each volume.

These two volumes complete Professor Fletcher's facsimile edition of Milton's poetical works. Volume III is a two-part presentation of Fletcher's close study of some 51 copies of the 1674 edition of *Paradise Lost*. In Part I, he discusses the composition, printing, and publication of this second edition of Milton's epic. In Part II, he prints the edition in photographic facsimile, with duplicate reproductions to illustrate different printing states; and below the facsimiles, his textual notes give a meticulous typographical description of the edition and a collation of it with the first edition and the manuscript of Book I, which are printed in Volume II. Volume IV is a similarly organized study of some sixty copies of the 1671, first edition of *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, which is collated with the 1680, second edition of these two poems. An appendix, containing additions and corrections for Volumes I and II, concludes this final volume of Professor Fletcher's work.

In some respects, Volumes III and IV show that Professor Fletcher has profited from the censure of his earlier volumes. He has silently accepted the corrections of Parker and Greg, that Matthew Simmons printed nothing by Caryl before 1650,¹ and that portraits were printed on a special press;² and in the textual notes, the final two volumes seem more accurate than were I and II, particularly I. My own check of parts of III and IV has revealed only the following corrections, which for the most part concern errors and omissions of a minor nature. *Volume III*. Pp. 1, 14: Elizabeth Milton's receipt and release are not, as Professor Fletcher implies, the property of the University Library, Cambridge. These documents, as well as Milton's receipt of 1669, attributed II, 210 to Trinity College, are all prized possessions of Christ's College. P. 3: The failure here and IV, 3 to identify the Illinois copies by pressmark—the practice in I and II—is to be regretted, as it would have simplified the work of future students of Milton's text who wish to consult these volumes. The correct pressmarks of copies 51 and 52 are Ex. 3859.369. copy 1 and copy 2. P. 9: In the first quotation, the

¹ Cf. III, 8 and Parker, *PBSA.*, xli (1947), 41.

² Cf. III, 61 and Greg, *MLR.*, xxxix (1944), 415.

Stationers' Registers does not show two periods between "Carill" and "vj^d." P. 10: In the last line, as the facsimile on p. 11 shows, "written," should read "Written." P. 14: The 1682 translation of the "Republican Letters" is noted by Hans Eduard Fernow (*Milton's Letters of State*, Hamburg, 1903, p. 8) as having been printed perhaps at Amsterdam. P. 15: In l. 4 of the transcript, "title," should read "Title." Compare the "T" in this word with that in "Twelve," l. 7, and with initial lower case "t"s in ll. 1, 3, 5, and 9. P. 16: Is not the symbol transcribed in l. 20 as "a[?nd?]" merely the digit "2" tipped slightly to the left, as it sometimes appears in seventeenth century manuscripts? P. 46: The situation described in the last three sentences of this page could be more simply put by merely saying that to obtain four lines for p. 144, the printer reduced pp. 136-41 from the usual 34 lines to 33, and pp. 142-43 to 32. P. 119: The Columbia note to *PL.*, II, argument, 15, "*op'nd and* 1669 *open'd vnd*," calls for a note in this edition to argument, 16, which points out that four copies of the second printing of the preliminary leaves of the first edition show "*and*" printed with an inverted "*a*," which Columbia misreads as "*v*." *Volume IV.* Pp. 32-34: An explanation would seem called for here as to why only 56 of the sixty copies figure in the collation of K and the remaining signatures. P. 51: The note to l. 11, "*J. M.*" The period after the *M* is battered," is not entirely accurate; in copy 56 the period is undamaged and prints clearly. P. 131: To be more complete, the note to l. 370 should indicate that copy 56 also reads "*leag*" and that copy 57 shows "*leag* ." with the period faintly discernible. P. 158: The Columbia note to l. 418, "*necks* necke" calls for a note in this edition which explains that the letter which Columbia reads as "*e*" in the 1680 edition seems actually a battered "*s*." P. 290: The numbers of the copies showing the first state of p. 98 are lacking. Appendix, p. 344-A: The discussion here should point out the textual significance of the Cardoyn Album: it confirms the spelling "*heaven*" in the Trinity College manuscript; the printed texts all read "*Heav'n*."³

In at least four other respects, however, Volumes III and IV show the weaknesses present in I and II. Professor Fletcher's style continues to be difficult, dull, and verbose. Not unusual are sentences like the following, which is not only unduly loose but also clogged with data that should have been relegated to a footnote.⁴

³Greg, *MLR.*, xxxix (1944), 412. In the first draft of these lines in the Trinity College manuscript, Fletcher transcribes the word incorrectly as "*heav'n*" (I, 430).

⁴III, 9. This difficulty arises from the fact that Professor Fletcher uses no footnotes in the first parts of III and IV, and seeks to make the bibliography of II (pp. 213-15) suffice for these last two volumes. As a result, the edition lacks adequate bibliographies, for the list in II does not by any

Simmons' name had seldom occurred in the pages of the relatively new *Catalogue of Books*, or *Mercurius Librarius*, begun in 1668 by John Starkey or by Robert Clavell, or by both, other printers, who were also booksellers, being much more greatly favored by Starkey and Clavell than was Simmons in this respect, see Arber, *Term Catalogues*, volume I:X, 'It claims to be "A Catalogue of Books printed and published at London": but the Editors quietly suppressed the names or initials of nearly all the Letterpress Printers, who did not often sell the books that they produced.'

Professor Fletcher likewise continues in his failure to draw a clear line between hypothesis and fact. In spite of Parker's protest, he continues to hold to his theory of Simmons's virtual bankruptcy;⁵ and I should like to see specific documentation for the following statement, particularly for the words "aimlessly" and "repeatedly postponed."⁶

... to hasten to bring to publication a second edition that both he and the author had been rather aimlessly preparing, perhaps since April of 1669 after the first edition had sold out, but which had been repeatedly postponed to make way for the publication of the Caryl material.

To my knowledge, we possess no direct evidence concerning the manner in which Milton revised *Paradise Lost* for the second edition, the period of time spent in that revision, or the precise way in which the Simmons printing shop operated. As Parker⁷ has pointed out, furthermore, we cannot be certain that the entire first edition was sold out by April of 1669: the contract merely called for payment of the second five pounds when 1300 copies had been sold; and the two titlepages dated 1669 and the two reprinted signatures suggest that Simmons may have sold as many as 200 copies after paying Milton on April 26 of that year. Evident also is Professor Fletcher's inexperience with seventeenth century handwriting. In Fletcher's transcripts of the three documents reproduced in III (pp. 10, 15, 17), French⁸ has pointed out some twelve errors, and to these may be added two that I have noted in my preceding paragraph.⁹ And finally, Professor Fletcher persists in what

means include all of the works cited in III and IV: for instance, those by Wing, Clavell, Lawrence, Whiting, and Bayle (III, 8, 9, 10, 25).

⁵ Cf. III, 9 and *PBSA.*, xli (1947), 45.

⁶ III, 13.

⁷ *PBSA.*, xli (1947), 39.

⁸ *JEGP.*, xlviii (1949), 416. This count does not include three questionable corrections involving "I" and "J." Since one symbol was often used in the seventeenth century to represent both of these capital letters, Fletcher's transcription "Interest," "I," and "Intitled" (III, 15, 5-6) seem as acceptable as French's "Interest," "J," and "Jntitled."

⁹ In criticising Fletcher, however, one should remember that transcription and collation are difficult tasks; and proof of this fact appears even in the reviews of Professor Fletcher's work. In his criticism of Fletcher's transcript of the nine line imprimatur (II, 33), French (*JEGP.*, xlv [1946], 459-60) lists nine errors. Working independently, Greg (*MLR.*, xlii [1947], 134) corrects three of Fletcher's errors with readings different from those offered by French and catches three misreadings by Fletcher that French

Greg and Wright¹⁰ have not unjustly called his fruitless preoccupation with detail for its own sake. In a reply to this criticism (III, 39-40), Fletcher defends his practice of noting minute variations of type; but to me at least, his defense is not convincing. For some rare bibliographical archeologist wishing to reconstruct the exact contents of the cases from which Milton's poetry was set, this mass of descriptive detail may have a value; but for others it seems of little significant worth,¹¹ and by its sheer bulk, it obscures the really important notes, those that record differences altering the meaning of Milton's verse. As a result of these failings, therefore, we still lack concise and reliable accounts of the printing of the primary texts of Milton's poetry as well as a convenient set of notes listing significant differences between those texts.

The ease with which one can offer negative criticism of Professor Fletcher's edition should not, however, lead us to overlook the positive virtues of his work. As his reviewers have been prompt to acknowledge, Professor Fletcher has shown that the process of printing Milton's poetry was considerably less complicated than we previously supposed; and his collection of facsimiles, though hardly exhaustive, and his careful collation of many copies of the same work have left us little, if any, excuse for continuing to have a poor text of Milton's verse. Before using the facsimile edition for serious work, the student of Milton will do well to annotate it with the corrections offered by various reviewers, particularly those by Greg, Wright, Parker, and French. As the student annotates the four volumes, he will also do well to reflect on the following. Not since Masson has a Miltonist undertaken singlehandedly a task comparable to this attempted by Professor Fletcher. In its tediousness it was a labor not unlike that imposed on Psyche; and a faultless execution of it would have required the aid either of the ants or of the eyes of Lynceus.

MAURICE KELLEY

Princeton University

had overlooked. Both of these reviewers are unusually skilled and accurate workers. Parker's acute review of I and II (*PBSA.*, xli [1947], 33-52) illustrates in a similar manner the difficulty of exact textual notes. On p. 40, n. 9, he records that Fletcher has a mistaken cross reference on I, 30 (366 for 367), but he overlooks another, four lines above in the same column (30 for 29). On p. 50, the two textual notes following "58: stage direction" should be in reverse order. On p. 51, Parker's note on 120: 8 would seem unnecessary in view of Fletcher's reference to the errata. Similar failings could be cited from other reviews and quite probably from this very note.

¹⁰ *MLR.*, xxxix (1944), 412; *The Library*, 5 ser., I (1946-47), 155.

¹¹ Why, for instance, should one note the close spacing of "which I" or the wide spacing of "to do" (*PR.*, I, 134, 203), as Fletcher requests us to do (IV, pp. 62, 66)?

Goethe, Dichtung — Wissenschaft — Weltbild. By KARL VIËTOR. Bern: Franke Verlag, 1949. Pp. 600.

Goethe, The Poet. By KARL VIËTOR. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. 341.

Goethe, The Thinker. By KARL VIËTOR. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. Pp. 212.

In the flood of Goethe literature which the year of the bicentennial celebration has released everywhere, Karl Viëtor's book stands out as one of the least eccentric. This is, indeed, high praise, considering the pitfalls which threaten everybody who attempts to convey the totality of this inexhaustible genius. His poetic works are so inextricably interwoven with his personal experiences that again and again Goethe critics have lost themselves entirely in the field of the purely bibliographical. On the other hand, a rigidly aesthetic approach only too easily loses sight of the majestic flow and *Gestalt* of this life which was in itself a work of art consciously created and by far surpassing the sum total of its individual manifestations. No clear-cut and exclusive method will lend access to the vastness of the intellectual and emotional profile of the man who was the last, if not the most expansive, *homo universalis* of Western civilization.

If Viëtor's book strikes the reader as authoritative, this impression is due not only to the thorough and polished mastery of the material presented, nor to its reliability even in minute detail. These qualities we had a right to expect of one of the leading Goethe scholars. It is the very lack of eccentricity, of an exclusive and "unusual" method which enables Viëtor to present so complete and many-sided a portrait of Goethe. He gives the biographical approach its modest due, just the minimum necessary for the reader to distinguish the outline of this long and prolifically productive life, and to become familiar with the decisive encounters which crystalized in his individual productions. To good advantage and very discreetly Viëtor employs a sociological approach when analyzing the *malaise du siècle*, a whole generation's oppressive feeling of socio-political frustration which found an explosive expression in *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, and which explains, at least in part, the almost frightening success of Goethe's first novel. In the case of Goethe's lyrics and of the formation and formulation of the "classical" ideal, strictly aesthetic and metrical problems are being discussed,—no mean achievement, indeed, if we consider the obstacle which the necessity of working with translations, grossly inadequate even at best, presents to an aesthetic analysis of a literary work of art. Yet Viëtor is at his best when, while never losing sight of his hero, he conveys to us the intellectual climate of an entire period from the point of view of the history

of ideas; for, as in the discussion of the problem of *Bildung*, of the perilous classical balance, of the Romantic rebellion, Goethe comes to stand as a symbol in which characteristic attitudes of Western man, intellectual forces of entire centuries have found a beautifully pure and spontaneous expression. It is exactly here, where the individual, Goethe, seems to submerge in the total vista of a general phase of European civilization, that his personal stature towers highest. It is in a chapter like "The Problem of *Bildung*," in which Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* is being discussed, that we learn more about the eighteenth century's benign optimism, its serene search for self-sufficient human stability and human values, than in any general presentation of the philosophy of this period.

Notwithstanding the great variety and flexibility of his approach, Viëtor fully succeeds in the goal he has set himself: "to comprehend Goethe's productive personality and the expression of this personality in works of literary art." Productive personality—this is indeed the clue to a true understanding of Goethe. For no poet, with the possible exception of Shakespeare, represents so little as he the type of the "man of letters" who may fascinate us by a philosophy of life, a system of aesthetics, the artistic perfection of an individual work of art. He seems indeed the embodiment of a dark and demonic creative force: in his youth an almost reckless iconoclast filled with tempestuous and uncontrollable creativity, in his mature years a seeker after the law according to which the creative force manifests itself in visible forms, in his old age the apostle of ceaseless and active endeavor and the patient observer and recorder of the eternal rhythm of growth, death, and rebirth. It was this *élan vital* which he perceived everywhere, in nature, in art, in every individual; and, in a monism of unprecedented scope, he recognized the same force, working in accordance with the same formative principles, in every plant, every human being, every truly great artistic achievement. "An inwrought form unfolding in the living process of existence"—this is the magic key to his world-view, and if he extended his activities to the study of botany, zoology, anatomy, morphology, meteorology, and optics, he did so not in dilettantish playfulness, but because he thought to find the same force at work in the innumerable manifestations of organic and inorganic life. What he really sought was the secret of God's workshop, which to him, however, was not a hidden principle, but a "secret, manifest" in every visible living phenomenon; and he may have come closer to it than any other mortal ever has. It was probably this which Emerson had in mind when he said: "The old eternal genius who built this world has confided more to this man, Goethe, than to any other."

It is quite evident that such a total world-view refuses to subjugate and reduce the variety of vital possibilities to any one principle, e. g. in the field of human life to the plane of morality alone. Without ever indulging in polemics, Viëtor implicitly re-

futes all the philistine attacks against Goethe, the immoralist, the egotist, the aloof Olympian. His excellent and comprehensive discussion of Goethe's greatest work should establish convincingly that the attempt to twist *Faust* into a behavioristic model represents a gross misunderstanding not only of Goethe's greatness, but of poetic, indeed of human greatness altogether. (It is deplorable that especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries this misreading of *Faust* has been so rampant and persistent, up to and including Santayana's misinterpretation in his *Three Philosophical Poets*). If ever there was a presentation of man and his destiny in terms of "existence" (without all the faddish connotations this word implies today), then it is to be found in Goethe's *Faust*. A sphere of abstract morality, severed from the total complex of man's creative vitality, Goethe never recognized, and it is characteristic enough that he liked to describe his own life's activities by the insoluble dual-phrase "my moral-aesthetic endeavors."

If we had to voice any criticism at all against Viëtor's Goethe portrait, our stricture would apply to some slight traces of "genteelness" which are discernible in his profile of the great poet. They are slight, indeed; Viëtor by no means suppresses the dark sources which fed this life and work. Yet especially in his analyses of *Iphigenia*, *Tasso*, and *Hermann and Dorothea*, he underplays somewhat the agonizing tensions, the cruel suffering, the "fear and trembling" at the sight of the destructive forces within man and surrounding man. To be sure, Goethe's last word is never a word of despair; but the one before the last sounds somewhat more somber than it does in Viëtor's rendition.

Still, even these shortcomings may turn out to be advantages. Viëtor's book addresses itself not primarily to the Goethe expert, but rather—and most successfully—to the general "cultured" reader to whom the stylistic ease and plasticity of the text (aptly translated by Moses Hadas) will greatly appeal. To this reader, then, the softening of some of the dark undertones may even be of benefit. The main outlines of Goethe's features will stand out more clearly just because some of the shadows which would make the total picture richer and fuller are missing. And the initiated reader will be easily capable of filling in these gaps. It was Goethe who once remarked that every really good book forces the reader to "supplieren." Measured by this yardstick, as well as by any other valid one, Viëtor's *Goethe* is a "really good book."

The companion volume, in the excellent translation of B. Q. Morgan, contains the material which under the headings "Der Naturforscher" and "Der Denker" make up the second part of the German edition. Viëtor acts very wisely in presenting Goethe's scientific views and his general *Weltanschauung* in small, almost independent chapters. The danger which such a procedure involves of presenting disconnected particles and losing the "red thread,"

Viëtor happily avoids by returning again and again to Goethe's basic notions of arch-type, polarity, variation, metamorphosis, and intensification. Thus he gives, in the field of Goethe's scientific endeavors, a demonstration of the concept of morphology, without running the risk of pressing into a rigidly scientific system what Goethe never meant to be a "system" in the scientific sense. And while again refraining from any polemic attitude as to Goethe's scientific achievements, he confronts most instructively Goethe's views with those of the natural scientists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and especially in his excursus on Darwin, clearly brings to life the salient features of Goethe's organic concept of morphology. Viëtor by no means overlooks the basic unity of all of Goethe's expressions, poetic, scientific, philosophical, although, in this respect, one might wish for an even stronger integration. Still, a reader who has followed Viëtor's presentation from beginning to end will acquire as total and comprehensive a view of this exciting human phenomenon "Goethe" as he can possibly hope to find anywhere.

OSKAR SEIDLIN

Ohio State University

Strindberg et le théâtre moderne. I. L'Allemagne. Par MAURICE GRAVIER. Bibliothèque de la société des études germaniques. II. Lyon, Paris I. A. C. 1949. Pp. vii + 179. 225 fr.

In attempting to trace European indebtedness to Strindberg, M. Gravier logically selects in this Volume I, Germany as point of departure, the country which early adopted Strindberg as one of her own, the country from which the Strindbergian revolution spread. German naturalism is seen influenced by Strindberg's *The Father*, *Miss Julie*, *The Creditors*; German expressionism as drawing nourishment from Strindberg's mystical and dream plays. However, also less known works, the novellen, appear as sources.

Specific Strindbergian motifs (the marriage problem, vampire woman, psychic murder) are sought in German plays. By following this process, M. Gravier makes Strindberg—by virtue of his novelle *Slitningar* (*Frictions in Gifts* I, 1884 [*Married*] I, German translation 1889)—godfather of Hauptmann's *Einsame Menschen* (1891). M. Gravier's main claim rests upon the similarity in the first part of the intrigue—the intrusion by the modern woman (the German Anna Mahr and the Swedish baroness) in each case a guiltless intrusion, upon the rights of the intellectually undeveloped, one-sidedly domestic wife. Rebecca West in Ibsen's *Rosmersholm* (with which *Einsame Menschen* generally is connected) creates with her amoral scheming, it must be admitted, a

totally different intrigue. But the final outcome, the inevitable tragedy in both Hauptmann's and Ibsen's plays—as against Strindberg's tame, practical solution, which M. Gravier disregards—would seem completely to outweigh the initial agreement between German and Swedish versions. Furthermore, this intrusion motif can be said to be rather common. It might also be noted that Strindberg in this schematic triangle-novelle seems to stress his ideal of a wife, here wife II. As second argument, M. Gravier ventures that even the tragic ending of *Einsame Menschen* might have been suggested to Hauptmann by the words of Strindberg's baron: "skiljas? Det vore att dö." And he concludes: "il [Hauptmann] a su admirablement dissimuler son menu larcin et naturaliser cet article d'importation nordique." Hauptmann's *Elga* (reconstruction of Grillparzer's *Das Kloster bei Sendomir*) reveals, according to M. Gravier, decidedly Strindbergian traits e.g. the woman is robust, combative, crafty, in contrast to the weakly, self-effacing husband. In *Gabriel Schillings Flucht*, Schilling himself is perhaps intended as a portrait of Strindberg.

The reader gains valuable information regarding the scientific foundation upon which Strindberg's new psychological determinism rests. Material (mainly Strindberg's *Vivisektioner*), difficult of access, is summarized. The conception of hjärnornas kamp and själemord becomes startlingly clear. Of the salient innovations in Strindberg's naturalistic dramas, the vampire woman, it is claimed, literally invades the German stage. German drama, however, completely ignores Strindberg's rule of simplicity; as shining exception to this rule, Schlaf's little masterpiece *Meister Ölze* is singled out.

In regard to the vexed question of Wedekind's dependence or independence of Strindberg, M. Gravier assembles considerable evidence that Wedekind was not "the great erratic boulder in the German plain," as is sometimes claimed. *Frühlings Erwachen* (1891) does show important parallels with *Dygdens lön* (Reward of virtue, *Asra*) in *Giftas* I. The same theme of puberty in modern society succumbing, overwhelmed by sex-urge, occurs. Both authors attack parents and society (Strindberg also the church) for not aiding the young. But might not the fact be mentioned that the attack is launched from different angles? Wedekind's high-school children go down due to indulgence. Strindberg's Theodor goes to wrack and ruin, physically and mentally, for inhibiting natural urges, while the uninhibited counter figure, Theodor's brother, survives, represents in fact a healthy successful specimen (cf. same idea in *Tjänstekvinnans son*). In Wedekind's Lulu (*Erdgeist* 1895) M. Gravier sees a variation of Strindberg's vampire. However, "chez Wedekind c'est la chair qui tue; chez Strindberg le cerveau s'attaque au cerveau." The new expressionistic technique that Wedekind inaugurates in *König Nicolo* (*So ist das Leben*) is

attributed to the influence of Strindberg's mystical drama *To Damascus* I (and II, 1898, German translation 1899). The germ of the whole expressionistic movement, however, is seen to lie farther back, in the famous *Miss Julie* preface, in which the poet substitutes "soul" (a conglomeration) for the rigid classical "character."

From Strindberg's naturalistic dramas, M. Gravier finds, German writers had borrowed merely isolated elements. *To Damascus*, however, becomes the mould into which German expressionists pour their experiences and sensations. The stations of Calvary are thus imitated. Strindberg's strong personal feeling of loneliness, of being cursed echoes in the hearts of German youth, particularly among Jewish expressionists (cf. Toller's *Wandlung*). Philosophical, eclectic religion prevails in Strindberg's monastery and in Werfel's (*Spiegelmensch*). The very frequent German expressionist theme, father-son hatred, constitutes a variation of Strindbergian idea of the curse resting upon the family. The complete re-creation of the dramatis personae (the "Ausstrahlungen des Ichs," surrounding the Ego, the Poet) inaugurated in *To Damascus* and *The Dream Play*, is followed by German expressionists. The preliminary notice in *The Dream Play* becomes programmatic. Strindberg's tendency to group figures, as in the medical gymnastics scene in *The Dream Play*, reappears e.g. in the macabre ballet, the dance of the skeletons in Toller's *Wandlung*. The plasticity of form in Strindberg's mystic dramas, which follows all the vagaries of a dream or hallucination, is emulated in Germany, however, in a more heavy-handed, thorough way. In vain Sorge's *Bettler* wrestles with the problem of action, brands his own creation a hippopotamus.

German expressionists diverge, however, intentionally from the conception of the goal in *To Damascus*: den Okände strives onward and upward toward the monastery of aristocratic seclusion, while the German hero is apt to become an active apostle who addresses crowds, urges universal love, equality of man, even political revolution. Still also here, M. Gravier hears echoes of Strindberg. And rightly so.

The present volume spreads over a wider field in its eager search for sources than does Carl Dahlström's *Strindberg's Dramatic Expressionism* with which one involuntarily compares it. However, the nature and norms of German and Strindbergian expressionism are explored more deeply by Dahlström. Unfortunately numerous errors occur in M. Gravier's volume, some of them disconcerting e.g., 2 in I, p. 143: "Et blies und fauchte meine Seele an," for "Er blies und fachte meine Seele an." Still such errors are of minor importance compared with the work as a whole.

CAROL K. BANG

The Johns Hopkins University

Writings on Elizabethan Drama. By J. LE GAY BRERETON. Collected by R. G. HOWARTH. Melbourne University Press, 1948. Pp. 115.

George Chapman—the Effect of Stoicism upon his Tragedies. By JOHN WILLIAM WIELER. New York, King's Crown Press, 1949. Pp. x + 218.

The Populace in Shakespeare. By BRENTS STIRLING. New York, Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. 203.

Professor Brereton, the distinguished Australian scholar and critic, died in 1933; and the volume of his *Writings on Elizabethan Drama*, ably edited by his pupil and friend R. G. Howarth, is an attempt to rescue some of his miscellaneous articles and notes from the obscurity of their original publication in little-known journals and books. As a collection, it is necessarily uneven in quality. The impression that emerges from the entire book is that of a learned and sensitive writer; but many of the separate pieces are, unfortunately, limited in their appeal and usefulness today. Some are badly outdated, and others were never meant for a scholarly audience.

There seems little point, for example, in reprinting a brief popular essay on "The Elizabethan Playhouse," written for a school edition of *Henry V*. In the light of later and more thorough treatments of the subject, Brereton's sketchy survey is bound to seem thin and inadequate. The most ambitious essay in the volume is that on "Marlowe's Dramatic Art studied in his *Tamburlaine*." Few scholars today would accept Brereton's thesis that "the characterization and plot [of *Tamburlaine* are] an exposition of the Machiavellian ideal." The studies of Kocher and others have revealed that Marlowe's world of ideas is a far more complex one than that described by Brereton. His discussion of Marlowe, however, like his essays on "John Marston," and on "Shakespeare's *Richard the Second*," is marked by frequent flashes of insight and by a consistently readable style. If rarely subtle or striking, Brereton's judgments are almost always interesting. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that he was more gifted as a critic than as a scholar; and it is a pity that he never found the time for a large-scale work. Perhaps the most rewarding piece in the entire volume, and the one most likely to last, is the entertaining *jeu d'esprit*, "The Case of Francis Ingram," a neat parody of some of the higher flights of scholarly conjecture.

Of the textual notes, the only one which has not been easily available before is that on "Nathaniel's Accident." Its interpretation of *L. L. L.*, V, ii. 565-576, will probably seem strained and over-subtle to most readers.

Dr. Wieler's book on Chapman, a Columbia dissertation, goes over some well-traveled ground. The influence of Stoicism on

Chapman has been discussed by many writers, notably by Schoell, and is an accepted commonplace of Elizabethan literary history. The novelty of Dr. Wieler's work lies in his attempt to show that Chapman became progressively less effective as a writer of tragedy because of his increasing devotion to Stoic doctrine. This whole theory rests upon a number of rather doubtful and unprovable assumptions. Dr. Wieler asks us to believe that Chapman's thinking was not vitally affected by the Stoic philosophers until 1611-12; but the evidence which he several times cites for this statement, Miss Phyllis Bartlett's remark in her edition of Chapman's poems that his principal reading in 1611-12 was Wolfius' Epictetus, is itself an assumption drawn from Chapman's work and not based upon any independent evidence. Wolfius was available to Chapman from the very beginning of his career, and the probability is that Chapman knew the work very thoroughly long before 1611.

It is undoubtedly true, as Dr. Wieler makes clear in the course of a painstaking analysis of Chapman's tragedies, that the later ones are more self-consciously Stoic, as well as less powerful theatrically, than the earlier *Bussy*. But this is not to prove that the injection of a doctrinaire Stoicism into the plays caused the decline in dramatic force; it may simply be a symptom of that decline. Finally, we may question the assumption that Stoicism and tragedy are necessarily incompatible. The Elizabethan drama is full of notable examples to the contrary—Massinger's *The Roman Actor* for one.

Dr. Wieler makes one unfortunate error, which he repeats several times. He assumes that the Epilogue to *Bussy* was written in 1610, when, according to Parrott, Chapman revised the play; and he interprets the Epilogue as promising a sequel to the tragedy, a promise fulfilled in *The Revenge of Bussy* in 1610 or 1611. This Epilogue, however, together with a companion Prologue, first appears in the 1641 edition. The Prologue, with its reference to the actor Nat Field as dead, is generally considered to have been written for a 1634 revival of the play; and the Epilogue must have been written at the same time, since it continues the theme of the Prologue. The two together constitute a plea for leniency toward a new actor who is playing *Bussy* for the first time. The first lines of the Epilogue, "With many hands you have seen D'Ambois slain,/Yet by your grace he may revive again," do not promise a sequel to the play, but as the succeeding lines make clear, call on the audience to applaud the new actor and encourage him to assume other roles.

One minor point of detail should be noted. Professor Fredson T. Bowers' first name is incorrectly given in the bibliography as Frederick.

Professor Stirling's book on *The Populace in Shakespeare* reminds us once again that Shakespeare's political ideas and attitudes cannot be judged by present-day standards. Those who would like to regard him as a spokesman for democracy have

consistently tried to explain away his unsympathetic treatment of the populace; while others have made much of his supposedly anti-democratic and reactionary viewpoint. It is the great virtue of Professor Stirling's work that it puts Shakespeare's mob scenes in their Elizabethan context, and shows that they reflect, not Shakespeare's own private views, but the tensions and conflicts of his time. The weakness of the book, however, is its narrow and one-sided treatment of Elizabethan social forces. To Professor Stirling, who cites numerous books and documents of the period to prove the point, Shakespeare's fear of the populace embodies the Elizabethan fear of Puritan and Anabaptist uprising. That Englishmen in the 1590's were desperately afraid of any threat to their hard-won and precariously established social and political stability is unquestionably true. They did not, however, regard the Puritan threat as the only one or even the main one. More important to them was the danger of a revival of feudal disorder, of the struggle between powerful factions, each rallying the people to its own side. One must not forget that Essex expected the London populace to rush to his side and help him seize power. Or, to take another example, the civil wars which had devastated France for many years were to the Elizabethans preëminent warnings of the horrors of social disorder; and the villains of that conflict to them were the Leaguers, not the Huguenots.

There is a good deal of unnecessary and tedious exposition in this book. Professor Stirling could, one feels, have assumed more familiarity on the part of his readers with scenes and speeches of Shakespeare's plays; at the very least, he could have assumed that they had copies of Shakespeare's works within easy reach. Many sections of the book show evidence of padding; and even the sensible and judicious commentary on other interpretations of Shakespeare's handling of the populace is longer than necessary. The conclusion contains some rather startling *obiter dicta*, such as the listing of Cervantes, Rabelais, Milton, and Bunyan, among others, as writers who are "primarily effective when they take the negative view" (p. 187).

The style is often heavy-handed and sometimes careless. Shakespeare, we are told on p. 69, "seems to have been reminded automatically of olfactory dismay when writing of artisans as a group." It is impossible that Professor Stirling could have intended such a distortion of English as the statement on p. 182 that "most interpreters . . . have sought to remove Shakespeare from the stigma of political negation or pessimism." In the second sentence of p. 175, Professor Stirling, if I understand him correctly, says exactly the opposite of what he means. On p. 159, Jonson is three times given as Johnson.

SIDNEY THOMAS

Queens College

Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition. By F. MICHAEL KROUSE. Princeton: Princeton University Press, for University of Cincinnati, 1949. Pp. xii + 159. \$3.75.

Dr. Krouse's ultimate purpose is to explain *Samson Agonistes*—that is, to throw light on Milton's intention and his artistry—by considering the tragedy in relation to Christian commentary on the Samson story. What he has indubitably succeeded in doing is to provide, for the first time, a comprehensive history of this Christian commentary.

He presents it in four informative and well-organized chapters on: (i) the Foundations of the Samson Tradition (as these appear in Judges, together with the interpretation in Hebrews 11.32-4); (ii) the Samson of the Patristic Period (in which allegorical are added to literal expositions, and certain clearly defined centres of interest, not all of them mutually compatible, emerge, such as the *moral*, with Samson as an example of unchastity and its consequences, and the *prophetic*, with Samson as a type of Christ); (iii) the Samson of the Scholastic Period (one of whose tendencies was to concentrate upon the later episodes of the hero's life and his relations with Dalila, so that the story was sometimes interpreted as a mediaeval tragedy, "a great man's fall from happiness to misery, resulting [in this instance] from the perfidy of a woman"); and (iv) the Samson Tradition in the Renaissance (where there was a much less clearcut division between Protestant commentary and Roman Catholic than is revealed in Miss Pope's companion study of the background of *Paradise Regained*; and where, indeed, all the more important interpretations were represented, and Samson appeared "as a tragic lover; as a man of prodigious strength; as the ruler and liberator of Israel; as a great historical personage whose downfall was caused by the treachery of a woman, and therefore as an example of the perils of passion; as a sinner who repented and was restored to grace; as the original of Hercules; as a consecrated Nazarite; as a saint resplendent in unfailing faith; as an agent of God sustained by the Holy Spirit; as a figure of Christ"). Such, in briefest outline, is the history of the tradition as Dr. Krouse presents it.

Even apart from the light which it throws on Milton, this history was well worth writing; for it is something to know the successive stages by which, on a given subject, the Christian built upon, and transformed, the Hebrew tradition. Nor will anyone doubt that here also is information which the critic of *Samson Agonistes* requires, and which he has heretofore lacked or possessed only in fragmentary and imperfect form. Milton's tragedy is his version and interpretation of the half-barbaric legend embodied in the Book of Judges; and Dr. Krouse has demonstrated that for all its principal features there is precedent in the commentators. This, so far as Milton is concerned, is the chief contribution of the

book; and in general its author is cautious of claiming for it anything more. Occasionally however, in the concluding chapter, on Milton's *Samson and the Tradition*, he is betrayed into such statements as this (p. 88): that "Milton probably did not make any . . . conscious selection" of details of the story suitable for tragedy, but simply followed the tradition; which is absurd. We need all the information we can get, and are grateful for it; but when it is all in hand, the critical problem of why, among the varied possibilities of the tradition, Milton selected what he did, or why his attention was focused as it was, still remains, and until it is solved we are as far as ever from grasping the secret of the poem's power. The defect in Dr. Krouse's critical method is that, instead of allowing the poem to tell him what only the poem can tell, namely, where Milton's emphasis fell and what finally the *Samson* story meant to him, he starts from the tradition and eagerly ransacks the poem for correspondences, in which indeed it abounds.

Now, it is perfectly clear from the poem that, within the limits set by a general fidelity to the scriptural story (for this is Christian poetry, and not fiction but divinely authenticated fact), Milton is concerned to write a tragedy, not in the restricted mediaeval, but in the full Aristotelian sense, and that this conditions his treatment of the action and of the hero. That it necessitated no radical departure from the tradition, but only selection and emphasis, is a fact of interest and importance, which does nothing, however, to alter our sense of the poem's meaning. Again, it is evident from the poem that Milton has chosen to throw a heavy emphasis upon Samson's initial dedication to God's service, upon his sin (which in Milton's interpretation is singularly like Adam's), his punishment, his repentance, and his final restoration to God's service; an emphasis far beyond the bare demands of tragedy for a noble character with a fatal flaw. These elements were present in the tradition; but, once more, why did Milton select them and present them with such marked emphasis? Of Samson's blindness (of course, part of the tradition), Dr. Krouse admits: "Milton communicated the intense pathos of blindness more vividly than any writer possessed of sight could have done" (p. 106). But if in this case one is to seek in Milton's own experience the source of his special emphasis and power, why not in others? Like Professor A. H. Gilbert, and in measure Professor W. R. Parker, Dr. Krouse is distrustful of reference to Milton's experience; and he imagines that when he has found precedence in the tradition for some particular feature of the poem, this automatically rules out such reference; but still there is the problem why Milton chose to emphasize it, which reference to the tradition, clearly, will not resolve. Thus Dr. Krouse will concede to the poem's extraordinary aptness to the conditions of Restoration England (and perhaps in particular to Milton's predicament in the year of the Restoration) only the admission that the political bearings of Samson's career were not unknown to the

tradition, and that Milton accepted and built upon this fact. But to infer from the presence of something in the tradition that its presence in the poem, with whatever degree of emphasis and power, is sufficiently accounted for thereby, and has no further significance, is to fall into a *non sequitur*. The value of a study of the tradition is to illustrate the range of choice open to Milton: it cannot in itself tell us why he adopted one part and rejected another. But Dr. Krouse is very reluctant to admit that he rejected any part at all, and proceeding from the tradition to the poem, instead of reversing the order, he tries to persuade us that for Milton Samson was a type of Christ because this was part of the tradition, because the informed reader would expect it, and because Milton did not do anything in his presentation of the Samson story to contradict it. But did he not? Even in the tradition, whose critical standards were far less exacting than Milton's, an emphasis upon the moral centre of interest, upon Samson's sin and repentance, was seen to be incompatible with an emphasis upon the prophetic, upon Samson as a type of Christ. And in Milton a very heavy emphasis upon Samson's sin and repentance is quite unmistakable.

Dr. Krouse's history of the tradition is valuable in itself. In relation to *Samson Agonistes* it is valuable in showing how rich were the materials among which Milton could select what best suited his purpose. The danger is that it should distract attention from the poem or be supposed to explain more than any tradition can possibly explain. This danger Dr. Krouse's admirable study does not entirely escape.

A. S. P. WOODHOUSE

University of Toronto

The Court Wits of the Restoration. By JOHN HAROLD WILSON. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948. Pp. vi + 264. \$4.00.

The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy. By JOHN HARRINGTON SMITH. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948. Pp. xi + 252. \$3.50.

The evil that the Restoration court wits did has indeed lived after them. Their evil bones were frequently disinterred during the nineteenth century, nor is there a particularly noticeable dearth of twentieth-century recriminations. Several estimable scholars (Pinto, Prinz, etc.) have recently smiled indulgently at the court wits or whitewashed them generously. Mr. Wilson in his *Court Wits* has followed none of these channels. He has adopted the more successful method of placing the wits in their environment and allowing their actions to speak for them. Mr. Wilson is

intimately acquainted with the court of Charles II—its society, its economics, its morals, its politics. And his judgment is unswerving.

Mr. Wilson approaches his subject with scholarly acumen, a brisk wit, and an abiding skepticism. He takes nothing for granted. He subjects every assertion past and present to a rigid scrutiny before using it for proof. He eschews "the clack of scandalous tongues," "lurid tradition," "gossip mongers," and the "errors and credulities of modern biographers." As a result *The Court Wits* is almost certainly the most accurate historical portrait of these notorious rakes that we shall ever have. There is little need to debate their morals further because man can seldom agree on morals anyhow. Here, at least, we have the facts.

From the flesh-and-blood of the *Court Wits* to the papier-maché of the *Gay Couple* is truly a long leap. And yet the two books complement each other. For here in Mr. Smith's *Gay Couple* the court wits and their ladies, the men and women of mode, and the pseudo-wits and dunces masquerade in literature as their authors, mistakenly or not, supposed they did in life. Like Mr. Wilson's court wits, Mr. Smith's gay couples begin by regarding love and life as a game and then change in the end to men and women of sense.

In eight well-integrated chapters Mr. Smith traces the fortunes of gay lovers from Elizabethan comedy to Steele's day and the victory of "exemplary comedy"—he disavows the term "sentimental comedy" because "it means different things to different people." He finds that love was a game between gay couples of the 1660's to be followed by the ascendancy of the gallant. Then the ladies and the reforming dramatists like Shadwell began to effect changes that by 1690 placed the gay couple on the defensive and helped pave the way for "exemplary comedy."

Mr. Smith's method is to prove his point by examples. Thus he brings a wealth of dramatic illustration to each of his eight chapters. Few people have read as many seventeenth and eighteenth century plays as Mr. Smith; fewer have remembered so many details from them. In a way, Mr. Smith's carriage slows down and occasionally sinks in the mire of detail. The reader finds it physically impossible to keep all the gay couples from *Much Ado* to *The Conscious Lovers* in his mind. His confidence in Mr. Smith's superior powers of retention must alone sustain him. Mr. Smith is an inveterate phrase-maker ("exemplary comedy," "sex-antagonism," "sympathetic comedy," "difficult heroine," "pursuing lady"). His phrases are useful for his purpose though it is extremely doubtful that they will attain general acceptance. Mr. Smith rather too frequently adopts a baffling subjectivity that proves nothing. Thus on p. 58: "This may to some readers suggest that they do not take their marriage seriously; it does not to me."

Both books are a boon to the literary and social aspects of the Restoration scene.

BRICE HARRIS

The Pennsylvania State College

The Romantic Imagination. By C. M. BOWRA. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xii + 306. \$4.50.

The persons who heard these lectures, delivered by the Charles Eliot Norton Professor of Poetry at Harvard in 1948 and 1949, were much more fortunate than most audiences. For they listened to a distinguished scholar, unusually well informed and sensitive to poetry, illuminate matters of fundamental import with rare simplicity. Long, abstract words, strange terms of uncertain meaning, as well as complexity of style and the display of learning are refreshingly absent from the lectures. It is novel, also, to find *Prometheus Unbound*, *Atalanta in Calydon*, and *The House of Life* treated without condescension by a distinguished classicist. One may, indeed, object that, save in the final chapter which assesses the strength and weakness of romantic poetry in general, too little is said of the limitations of the authors studied. Professor Bowra is concerned rather with analyzing a single outstanding poem or volume of each of the authors considered and with explaining it in part by the events and circumstances preceding its composition. This he does admirably, pointing out the seven sections into which *The Ancient Mariner* falls and the symbolism which "gives to it a new dimension"; the development of the thought in the Odes on Immortality and on a Grecian Urn together with the relation of the former to Coleridge's poetry and of the latter to Piranesi's vases; the Hellenism of *Atalanta in Calydon*; the pursuit of beauty as the main theme of *The House of Life* and the like. To be sure, not all the interpretations are convincing: "The main subject of the 'Ode on a Grecian Urn' is the creative ecstasy which the artist perpetuates in a masterpiece. . . . The belief that 'Beauty is truth, truth beauty' is true for the artist [only and for him only] while he is concerned with his art"; Shelley's nature descriptions in *Prometheus* are "relevant because they set a tone or create an atmosphere"; *Prometheus*, l. 607-15 constitute "some of the finest lines which he ever wrote" "From Coleridge Wordsworth took the idea of pre-existence and from Vaughan that of a slow decline in celestial powers, and from this combination formed his own original theory"; Wordsworth "abandoned" "the religion of nature" "soon after the completion of the Ode." In the lecture on the Immortality Ode nothing is said of the mystic experience, and the treatment of Wordsworth here and elsewhere suffers from the failure to make use of *The Prelude*.

But penetrating comments abound. A myth such as that used in *The Ancient Mariner* "first dissociates certain ideas and then gives a new appeal to them by setting them in new associations." "Only when he was free from the topics which engaged his philosophic curiosity was he [Coleridge] able to release all his imaginative

powers." Hence his success with the supernatural. "The astonishing thing about the *Songs of Experience* is that, though they were inspired by violent emotions and have a merciless satirical temper, they are in the highest degree lyrical." "As a poet Shelley was able to keep so close a relation with his ideas that they developed a special individuality for him, and it is this which he turned into poetry. . . . His Prometheus is not a real person in whose individual existence he believes, but a figure who symbolizes a great abstract idea." He held that "in the end evil is conquered because it breeds its own opposite." "Great art cannot but suggest something beyond its immediate or even its remoter meanings, an indefinable 'other,' which is the most important thing it has to give." *Atalanta in Calydon* has "meaning . . . in abundance. The play is constructed with hard thought, but it touches us at two levels, the one almost purely musical, the other largely intellectual . . . for instance, the lines spoken by the dying Meleager to his mother . . . are . . . undeniably poetry of a high order. They haunt the memory, and long familiarity with them does not dim their splendour. But are they tragic or even human? Does the emotion in them have any close connection with the emotions of a dying man? I doubt it."

The lectures are not thesis-ridden but the admirable one which opens the volume and that which concludes it point out what the others illustrate: that the English romantic poets are distinguished, not only from their English predecessors but from continental writers, by the importance they attached to the imagination and the belief that it is "closely connected with a peculiar insight into an unseen order behind visible things," that it "works through the senses to something beyond and above." "The Romantics believed that what matters most is this interpenetration of the familiar scene by some everlasting presence which illuminates and explains it. It is this which makes Romantic poetry what it is." The emphasis upon a conviction so fundamental but so commonly overlooked sets Professor Bowra's lectures apart from most studies in the field. It is to be regretted that a volume which should be owned, marked, and annotated will not take ink.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

Lord Byron's First Pilgrimage 1809-1811. By WILLIAM A. BORST.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948. Pp. xxiv + 179.
\$2.50. (Yale Studies in English, 109).

This book presents for two years what one would like to have extended over at least twenty more—an exactly detailed and comprehensive chronicle of Byron's daily activities. One obvious merit is that the coverage, a judicious consolidation of accessible record and legend (Byron's correspondence, Hobhouse's travelogue and the

varied reminiscence of contemporaries who met the two young men on their ramble), is more detailed than that in previous biographies and apparently as comprehensive as research conducted in this country could make it. Years of patient, determined sleuthing abroad might add some things here and there, but short of such an ideal and expensive undertaking, this account of the Mediterranean journey seems adequately complete. The achievement becomes the more laudable when one notices that, even with Hobhouse's journals, biographical materials for these two years are not nearly so abundant as they are for the later years when Byron's fame had multiplied them. Byron's own letters during the Mediterranean pilgrimage are less numerous than for subsequent periods.

The indispensable closeness of detail that make Borst's piecing together of available information valuable for finger reference naturally carries its own penalties, inherent in the execution of an all-inclusive purpose. Lest we miss *any* bypath, we must pace over them *all*, and some are bound to accumulate tediously or to seem a little trifling: for instance, the feud over erecting Tweddell's Athenian tablet, the cataloguing review of Byron's acquaintances during his second Athenian visit; and throughout the book the rather solemn and anxious footnote stretching after incidentals ("In the original letter which I have examined . . . Byron wrote 'will call' rather than 'would call,' as Prothero renders it." We must file away the facts that Captain J. J. Best *also* visited Zitzia thirty years after Byron had been there and found an old monk who asked if Byron had really written about his monastery, and further that forty years later Edward Lear *also* "visited . . . a priest who recollected well Byron's stay in 1809.")

Many novelties are offered for their isolated interest (the two pleasant grandsons of Ali Pasha, "the prettiest little animals I ever saw," with "pink complexions like rouged dowagers"), but as we follow the curious or bored or restless traveller around Southern Europe for two years, looking at the places and peoples he saw, noting what he thought and felt about them, the author reminds us persistently that this traveller is an alert youth for whom tangible experience becomes specific literary substance. Parallels, both immediate and remote, between Mediterranean impression and verse-expression are spotted with ledger-like efficiency. Scores of lines (not alone from *Childe Harold* and *Don Juan* but from many lyrics) are pinned to circumstance, and many whole paragraphs could be transferred as documentary annotation to an edition of the poems—where they certainly belong—to amplify, for example, the bull-fight passage, or to show the authenticity of a weak general line that has behind it the actual fragrance of an abundant shrub in the highlands of Alentejo. Future editors should be grateful to Borst for the copious notes he has furnished them. The steady application of the sound principle that Byron's verse is conscientiously grounded in the "data of experience" is

just as useful as the biographical chronicle, although the process almost necessarily becomes a conveyor belt of citations (not one must be allowed to slip by untagged) and the whole arranged operation is made obtrusively automatic by dozens of bridging clichés ("In *Childe Harold* he sings of"; "Nicopolis inspired Byron to reflect"; "The following are some of the passages"; "these sights were vivid in his memory when he wrote").

The pin-pointing of verse to experience is only a precise mechanism designed to substantiate the thesis that the two Mediterranean years were significantly formative, not only because they stored up specific substantial data to be later exploited but also because they directed, sometimes altered, sometimes solidified some of Byron's convictions, prejudices, and emotional patterns. The Maid of Zaragoza, the battle of Talavera, the Elgin Marbles, Mrs. Spencer Smith, some dogs devouring a corpse beneath the walls of the Seraglio, an executed body tumbling in the Dardanelles, the howling of Ephesian jackals are therefore not just oddities to be itemized because they become scattered verse deposits. As such "data" coalesce with many particular observations of character and society, of exotic custom, of the demoralizing pressures of war, despotism, and poverty, concretely and daily evident in Portugal, Spain, Albania, Greece, and Turkey, the two years do contribute a varied intellectual and emotional content to Byron's later writing. Thus the geographical, military, political, and environmental sections of the book are especially appropriate, because they expand the horizon of impression beyond the narrow focus on local incident and anecdotal sightseeing and expose the greater social area that made Byron's travel experience broadly and deeply formative. When the author considers the impact of such social observation on the young poet, he does his most thoughtful writing, as in his analyses of Byron's shifting, often paradoxical views about Napoleon, about the Spaniards harassed by the Peninsular War, and about Greek character and the Greek political future.

GUY STEFFAN

University of Texas

The Demon Lover; A Psychoanalytical Approach to Literature. By ARTHUR WORMHOUDT. Introduction by EDMUND BERGLER, M. D. New York: Exposition Press, 1949. Pp. 150. \$3.50.

In *The Demon Lover* Professor Wormhoudt applies "some of the newer findings of psychoanalytical psychiatry" to the English Romantic poets. The approach, primarily that of Dr. Edmund Bergler, is an adaptation and development of Freudian theory, from which it differs principally in its greater emphasis upon aggression as an element of the unconscious and its consequent reduction of the

role of the libido. An admirably clear and candid statement in the Introduction pays due heed to the problems involved in using psychoanalytical methods for literary interpretation. ". . . it should be remembered that psychological meaning in a work of art is only part of its total meaning . . . some readers may feel considerable disappointment and even resentment at learning that some of the poems have unconscious meanings which seem at variance with their better-known conscious meanings" (p. 15).

If Dr. Wormhoudt's interpretations of Romantic poems were as cautious as his preliminary statement we should have no complaint. They are, however, unacceptable despite his entire consistency and his painstaking scholarship. They depend too much upon acceptance of the system he uses, and thus have little literary interest. This is not to reject the Freudian approach, but only a wrong employment of it. Lionel Trilling's interpretation of Wordsworth's "Intimations" Ode, which contains some Freudian elements, is among the most helpful explications of the poem. G. Wilson Knight's *The Starlit Dome* has a critical value independent of its Freudian assumptions. The centre of *The Demon Lover*, however, is in psychoanalysis, not in the poems it analyzes.

The advantages of Freudian interpretation for literature lie in its elaborate symbolism and its recognition of the complexity of human experience. Its principal limitations are its scientific spirit, its attempt to transform literary complexity to psychological simplicity. Its deliberate incompleteness is a scientific virtue, but a literary defect. The claims which have been made for its vivid concreteness of image and symbol would seem to be at least partly fallacious, since the Freudian uses his symbol not to contemplate and enjoy, but merely to identify and put to work. Thus the Freudian triangle of mother, father, and infant is a group of abstract personifications which fail to awaken the imagination, and the system wherein domes and mountains are breast symbols, where streams, fountains and floods stand for "the source of liquid nourishment" (p. 13), reduces external reality to a scheme oversimple and meagre. So few are the basic elements of Freudianism, and so universal is their application, that a Freudian interpretation is likely to seem as unsportsmanlike as shooting a sitting duck, as for example in Edmund Wilson's treatment of James's "The Turn of the Screw." Set a too-eager Freudian on the trail and no external object, natural or artificial, is safe from him.

Dr. Wormhoudt explicates a large number of well-known Romantic poems with great care, fullness, and, given his point of view, acuteness. He sets out to tackle all the difficulties and solves them admirably—again, given his point of view. But his reduction of the matter of poetry to oral, anal, and oedipal experience is not fairly representative of his subjects. We can agree that poems contain various levels of meaning, but they must not be "at

variance" with each other, they must bear a discernible resemblance and relationship in order to be mutually acceptable. The greatness of great poetry," says the author, "is not diminished by learning its unconscious foundations" (p. 15). But in *The Demon Lover* the unconscious meanings are not foundations. They must either be accepted as the whole structure of the poems or else rejected as irrelevant; with other layers of meaning they have nothing to do.

This total discrepancy between Dr. Wormhoudt's unconscious meanings and the meaning which would seem to be dictated by the ordinary significations of words, the poet's conscious purpose, and the mood and attitude which the poet seeks to impose, is constant throughout his interpretations. Thus in Wordsworth's *Lines . . . Above Tintern Abbey* he suggests that the hedgerows run wild "symbolize the infant abandoned by the mother" (p. 54). Since, however, Wordsworth calls them "little lines of sportive wood run wild," and since the lines occur in a passage which most would take to express a perfect reconciliation of man and nature, the Freudian interpretation is hopelessly at odds with more accessible meanings. In *Michael* the fact that Michael's wife spins late at night is said to be "another hint that the mother symbol is hostile to men. For the thread which she spins will be made into cloth which will in turn be used to deny the infant those voyeuristic sights which it so much desires, just as it desires milk for its mouth" (p. 56). This reading is impossibly far from any conceivable purpose of Wordsworth or any non-psychoanalytical explanation whatever; it belongs to a different and presumably an alien system. It is likewise suggested that there is a deep ulterior meaning in the fact that Michael's cottage is called "The Evening Star." "The evening star is the goddess Venus whose associations with love and war, in the *Aeneid*, for example, traditionally center around the breast symbol" (p. 56). Now, in Wordsworth's poem the evening star stands for steadfastness; its associations are not with Venus, love, war, or breast symbols, but with the steady and purposeful industry of Michael and his family.

Dr. Wormhoudt's preconceptions, in fact, cause him to contradict rather than supplement other meanings, and at times unconsciously to ignore more purely literary explanations than would suit his purposes. He places great importance, for instance, upon the presumed passivity of Don Juan, since this emphasis corresponds with his interpretation of Byron himself. Don Juan, however, is not as passive as Dr. Wormhoudt makes out, in the first place; and in the second, Byron's hero has to be limited in scope to make room for Byron himself, whose very active personality is peering out in every stanza to catch the reader's attention. Despite its considerable virtues, *The Demon Lover* is unlikely to be of much use to the scholar or critic; for the psychoanalyst the case may well be very different.

RICHARD HARTER FOGLE

Tulane University

The Life of Ralph Waldo Emerson. By RALPH L. RUSK. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949. Pp. 592. \$6.00.

Biography is a controversial art. The mention of a life of Emerson premises at once analyses of the philosophic patterns which underlay his thinking; the craftsmanship in his prose and poetry; and particularly, today, the problems of communication in a writer concerned primarily with meanings from an invisible moral world. Emerson's central theme was Eternity. To cite only one example, young scholars are now speculative regarding the continuity of Emerson's language-forms in a consistent symbolism, with their beginnings in Puritan poetry and with their related or successive expressions in Thoreau, Hawthorne, Melville, Emily Dickinson (directly in debt to Emerson), and in poets of our own epoch.

Thus a biography of Emerson might reasonably become a prolonged intellectual history, taking us deep into a mind which Poe said reached its heights "by flashes," and which its owner sometimes felt attained its full powers only when inspired by "a whole sky," not to be confined within a linear language. It would be idle to maintain that this biography is more than incidentally engaged with such matters. Chapter XVIII, "Leaping and Piercing Melodies," is, as one instance, expository rather than aggressively critical of Emerson's beautiful and mysterious poetry; and Chapter XVI, "This Age, This Country, Oneself," with its informative accounts of "The American Scholar" and the "Divinity School Address," does not grapple with the psychological foregrounds of utterances which so strangely resemble both confessionals and trumpet-calls.

Yet, as I say, biography through the ages has been multiform, and Mr. Rusk has chosen rightly, I think, to write at this time, another kind of life. He has elected to tell simply the moving history of the seventy-nine years of life of our poet-philosopher. In describing so long a career there would be no space in even a volume of five hundred and ninety-two pages for the intellectual luxuries which I have outlined. Thus the writings themselves appear briefly, but arrestingly, as they appeared to their readers or as they might have been briefly summarized by their author. So the story, always the story itself, is told, as if by a protagonist, first (as it were) by the father, William Emerson, when at quarter past three on the afternoon of Election Day in the year 1703 he laid eyes on this son; then by Emerson himself, and, finally, by his children. The story is here in all its infinite detail. We see Emerson clearly for more than three quarters of a century of life in nineteenth-century America.

This is, in my judgment, the type of study needed for every major American writer as a base for the more daring excursions suggested in the first paragraph of this review. Such a biography is needed

for every classic American author, but especially for Emerson. All previous lives of him are incomplete. They are filial (Cabot) or impressionistic (Brooks) or outmoded (Woodberry) or oscillating between biography and criticism (Firkins); and all of them depend upon second-hand authorities and upon corrupt texts of that central Emersonian record, the "savings-bank," namely, the Journals. Mr. Rusk has had, as everyone knows, the unique opportunity of knowing at first-hand for many years all the primary sources: letters, journals, commonplace books, private collections of books, and manuscript versions of the published masterpieces. It seems to me that even if Mr. Rusk's personal wishes had inclined toward criticism, his duty was clear: to give us this kind of a biography.

This he has done conscientiously, making no concessions to what the critics or scholars might think he should have written, unless it be in the book's peculiar techniques of annotation. (I ascribe these, rightly or wrongly, to the thrift of his publisher). What we feel as we read on is not merely a strong sense of fact (for example, the sound of Emerson's own words or the tabulations of his income), but two uses of this fact. One is the supplementary knowledge which Mr. Rusk has acquired from magazines, diaries, memorabilia, and from his patient, devoted pilgrimages in Emerson's footsteps. (He quotes, for instance, from Italian newspapers). The other is, after his assembly of these vast materials, his thoughtful *selection* from these. The fault sometimes evident in biographies of this kind, a painful, laborious use of all available trifles, does not mar this book. For every detail given, one suspects that a dozen have been rejected. In other words, Mr. Rusk has mastered his material; the story is never clogged with repetitious or superfluous data. It flows on as simply as if Emerson himself had put first things first.

A corollary of this extraordinary control of multitudinous fact is the book's *perspective*. Seventy-nine years are a long time. It would have been easy for Mr. Rusk to scant Emerson's childhood, with, in his case, faint premonitions of his genius; to over-expand the years of fulfillment (1836 to 1850); to dawdle over the tragic terminus of this life, in its wealth of associations with other great men and women. Yet Emerson's childhood is as provocative in Mr. Rusk's narrative as the "twilight existence" after the "god of bounds" said "No more!" Throughout the four-score years, the emphases are sound. At the same time something of the serenity of this noble life has crept into the prose,—so simple, so detached. The familiar anecdotes are here, but more, much more. Mr. Rusk is at his best as he lets Emerson talk with or of Thoreau, Margaret Fuller, Channing, or Hawthorne, or as we watch him wait for the Concord people to go to church before he steals off for his Sunday morning walk in the woods. It is all so natural that even if the

biography is external in detail, wanting perhaps bold exploration into the inward Emerson, it is likely to remain a model of what a straightforward story of a great man-of-letters may be.

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

Yale University

A Concordance of Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass and Selected Prose Writings. By EDWIN HAROLD EBY. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 1949. Pp. xvi + 256. Four installments, of which this is Fascicle I.

A concordance is the last luxury of scholarship, but in the case of Whitman it has long been acutely wanted. Without this aid it is more difficult to locate passages in *Leaves of Grass* than in more conventional poetry; a concordance will also facilitate the study of Whitman's language and craftsmanship. Other such projects have been initiated and abandoned in the face of such difficulties as Professor Eby has overcome. Even the manuscript concordance in Brown University Library, completed in 1909, was judged to be too early to be of service in modern scholarship, and the editor has undertaken the arduous and expensive task afresh.

The margin for error and the problems of editorial and linguistic oversight were increased by the necessity to rely on student assistants and others under grants from NYA and WPA. Since accuracy is here the principal consideration, this reviewer is glad to report that his preliminary checking shows general dependability and a satisfactory linguistic analysis.

This first section of the concordance covers *Leaves of Grass* from "Abandon" to "Heart"—an ominous juxtaposition of words for the superstitious. The prose, to follow in a later fascicle, will include "Democratic Vistas," "A Backward Glance O'er Travel'd Roads," and the principal Prefaces. The present writer would wish to include at least the more familiar passages from *Specimen Days*, in order to balance the journalistic with the more literary prose of Whitman.

The text on which such a concordance is based should be an accurate reproduction of the 1892 edition. It should be generally available, and if possible in one volume. Emory Holloway's "Inclusive Edition" (Doubleday Doran), for example, is such a text, available now for many years, and widely disseminated. Instead, Professor Eby has selected the less accurate three-volume text published as part of the ten volume *Complete Writings of Walt Whitman* (1902), of which there were only five hundred sets, now widely dispersed, many in the hands of collectors.

This necessitates, for every entry, a notation of the volume, as

well as the page and the number of the quoted line. However, the editor has judiciously included a second reference for each entry, identifying the quoted entry as to the Section of the *Leaves* and the poem in which it is found, as well as the number of the line and stanza. Obviously the second index can be used with any edition, although the counting of lines will be tedious. If the primary edition were generally available, much of this waste would be avoided. Actual confusion arises between the two reference systems because Roman numeral "I" for Volume I in the first index is printed identically with capital "I" (for the Section entitled "Inscriptions") in the second index.

A problem common to all such works is the listing of "Words . . . whose meanings are a fixed and formal part of the language," such as articles, prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns, certain intensives, and the like. Of each of these the editor has given a number of "specimen selections." For each he has also included a "consecutive sample . . . to give a basis for the determination of frequencies." But generally this "consecutive sample" is not extensive enough to be trustworthy for the linguist's work; also there has been a tendency to select for this purpose passages in which the frequencies for the given word seem higher than those prevailing throughout.

This is however a specialized function of this work, and any possible flaw in connection with it is offset by the general usefulness of the whole. If this concordance, with its general reliability, can be completed, Whitman scholars will long continue to be indebted to Mr. Eby. They will have to use it before their eyes begin to fail, however, for the printers have provided a type that will prove an irritating handicap even for younger eyes.

SCULLEY BRADLEY

University of Pennsylvania

Herman Melville, A Critical Study. By RICHARD CHASE. New York: Macmillan, 1949. Pp. 305. \$4.50.

Mr. Chase's study of Melville is both enriched and confused by his diverse purposes, methods, and critical weapons. His purposes are to show what Melville's works say "within themselves," and to read them as a message for our troubled times. He also seeks to show that Melville had better "intellectual equipment" and greater "moral intelligence" than other critics have recognized. His method is partly but not primarily biographical; he studies the works chronologically and tries to trace the development of Melville's mind, but his chief interest is in locating and interpreting the "recurring and developing images, symbols, ideas, and moral

attitudes." As critical tools he freely uses the concepts and terminology of Freud, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Lionel Trilling, Arnold Toynbee, Constance Rourke, and ancient mythology, approaching Melville by turn through theories of psychology, politics, history, literature, folk-lore, and "myth" (in his own version of the current critical sense). All of this leads him to original insights and bold reinterpretations. Also to confusion and distortion.

Mr. Chase sees Melville's literary career on the personal plane as the quest of a fallen son for a father, and on a parallel national plane as the search of a fallen America for moral and social values. His writings are the records of this quest: half conscious, half unconscious, half art, half dream. The characters in them are projections of various aspects of himself as the fallen son, outcast, seeker, and of his various tentative attitudes such as regression, submission, defiance, aggression, and recognition and acceptance, that might lead out of his predicament and end his quest. These give rise to such recurrent "mythical" figures as the True Prometheus, the False Prometheus, the Ishmael, and the Handsome Sailor. And all may be translated to the national level.

In his presentation of the works, Mr. Chase telescopes the first five novels into one chapter, seeing them as evolving the characters and attitudes which reach full expression in *Moby-Dick*. Like everyone else, he finds *Moby-Dick* Melville's masterpiece. He analyzes its rhetoric and folk-lore elements, and sees Ahab as a False Prometheus and the White Whale as representing not evil but "the purity of an inviolable spiritual rectitude which, since it cannot be discovered among the imperfections of life, must be sought in death." He reverses the usual emphasis by devoting two-thirds of the book to the later works, evaluating *The Confidence-Man* as Melville's second best book. *Billy Budd* he reinterprets, denying that it is Melville's testament of acceptance, and defining it as regressive and an imperfect tragedy. His summary chapter would help his readers more if it were printed first.

Most troublesome is the message-hunting. Mr. Chase is sure beforehand what message he is going to find because he takes one with him on the search and brings back only what matches it. He is so eager to identify Melville as a Father of the "new liberalism" that he brings back in proof of the paternity not only real similarities—Melville's rejection of easy optimism, his acceptance of radical evil, his tragic view of life—but also forced parallels, wrenched from their original application, taken out of context, or abstracted from their obvious meaning. He too often lets the preconceived message determine his reading of what the works say "within themselves." He does not show good judgment or humanity in his aspersions on earlier liberals, inferentially including Parrington, Brooks, and Mathiessen, or in his repeated attacks on Henry Wallace. All of these faults are the modish marks of a clique, unworthy of Mr. Chase.

On a higher plane, one is troubled by his casualness about facts: his allegorizing both literature and life, his way of ignoring or misinterpreting the primary surface of works, his unconcern with Melville's actual biography. He blurs the distinction between raw materials and perfected art, between "dream" and what is recognized and confronted, between unconscious and conscious meanings. Of course, these involve critical theory; and different views are possible, but so is definition. Finally, one hopes Mr. Chase will reconsider the distinction between pedantry and scholarship.

One may say of this book what Hawthorne said of *Mardi*, that it is "a rich book, with depths here and there that compel a man to swim for his life. It is so good that one scarcely pardons the writer for not having brooded long over it so as to make it a great deal better."

HARRISON HAYFORD

Northwestern University

Philip Freneau and the Cosmic Enigma. The Religious and Philosophical Speculations of an American Poet. By NELSON F. ADKINS. New York: New York University Press, 1949. Pp. 84. \$2.50.

Although the period of the achievement of American independence contains in its literary production the heart of our intellectual heritage as a nation, there has been surprisingly little intellectual analysis of its literary fruits. For the most part, the years of what has been called the "American enlightenment" have been left to the historian, the political scientist and the student of religious doctrines. Professor Nelson Adkins deserves our gratitude, therefore, for this careful study of the intellectual development of Philip Freneau.

It is not an orderly development, regularly patterned, of which we learn here. Freneau was of that breed of whom it has been said that their mental energy exceeds their intellectual ability. Each new idea, each novel speculative theme, excited his eager interest for a season; then, with the waning of the season, his interest waned. The varied interests left inconsistent deposits in his mind and in his writing. When he considered fundamental questions of the relation of man to the universe, his answers were never single and simple, but were, rather, intricate interweavings of the residues of four chief types of speculative theory.

Chronologically the earliest of these was the Calvinist orthodoxy he inherited from his Huguenot ancestors. His family intended him for the ministry; he was prepared for and entered The College of

New-Jersey (Princeton). Here he was briefly influenced by the Arminianism and idealism of Bishop Berkeley, for at this time there was a Berkeleyan taint in this otherwise all-too Presbyterian institution. John Witherspoon was imported from Scotland to stem the tide while Freneau was at Princeton. In this intellectual atmosphere he began the study of theology; his attachment to this discipline did not persist, but in such poems as "The House of Night" it is apparent that he levied a tax on his theological readings.

Adkins finds a second stratum in Freneau's thinking to have been the new romantic "back-to-nature" ideology of which Rousseau was the chief exponent. After 1786, Freneau seems to have had first-hand acquaintance with some of Rousseau's work, but even before this time he had become familiar with the theme by its anticipations in classical and renaissance literature, as well as in the pre-romanticism of the eighteenth-century British poets. Freneau's "The American Village" offers the utopian quality of the agricultural community in the New World as an answer to the rue of Goldsmith's "The Deserted Village." Freneau's "The Philosopher of the Forest" gives fuller expression in prose to this agrarian optimism; even here, however, there appears the suggestion that commerce also bears an important part in leading man to a peaceful world. In "The Rising Glory of America" both agriculture and commerce appear as means to the development of American nationhood, a view somewhat inconsistent with the cosmopolitanism of "The Philosopher of the Forest." In this inconsistency Freneau was by no means unique in his time, or, for that matter, in ours.

Deism, the third stratum distinguished by Adkins in Freneau's thought, needs little exposition, since much of the discussion of the ideas of the eighteenth century has emphasized it. Adkins points out that much of Freneau's deism was stimulated by his interest in the scientific ideas of the age, stemming from the Newtonian cosmic synthesis, rather than from a concern for moral law. In his late didactic expression of deistic ideas, Freneau was influenced chiefly by Paine's formulation in *The Age of Reason*. Under this influence, Freneau also wrote his satiric parodies of the Scriptures.

Finally, Adkins points out that the influence of both deism and the back-to-nature ideology on Freneau's thought may be attributable in large measure to his early study and mastery of the Roman classics, especially Ovid, Lucretius and Horace. All of these authors were translated (fragmentarily) by Freneau.

In none of these views did Freneau find a place where his questing mind could rest. His *Last Poems* give evidence that at the end of his long life he was turning back toward the orthodoxy of his youth, even as the country turned back after its brief flirtation with rationalism. But he did not return with assurance; rather it

was with the sense that the wise man looks forward to death for the answers to the questions of human destiny that only fools expect to have answered in and by life.

JOSEPH L. BLAU

Columbia University

Alexander Pope's Prestige in America, 1725-1835. By AGNES MARIE SIBLEY. New York: King's Crown Press, 1949. Pp. xi, 158. \$2.50.

The reputation and influence of Pope in America is an interesting subject for study because it illustrates the staunch hold that the neoclassicists had in America long after the rise of the Romantics in England. Miss Sibley's little book is the only one which has been published on the subject, and unfortunately it closes before the time when Poe in the 1840's was annoyed by the talk of "the good old Pope" school and when two decades later rising young poets such as Timrod and Hayne were still complaining of the "gentlemen who know Pope . . . by heart, but have never read a word of Wordsworth or Tennyson."

The prestige of Pope in America began about 1725. In that year occurred the earliest sale which Miss Sibley has found of a copy of Pope by an American bookseller. The Harvard library had a copy of his works as early as 1728; Yale had one by 1733; and large private libraries of the mid-eighteenth century, such as those of William Byrd and Robert Morris, contained copies. The earliest known American reprint of Pope was an edition of the *Essay on Man* published in Philadelphia in 1747.

A major factor in the popularity of Pope's poetry in eighteenth century America was its "shining ethics" and its "wealth of practical wisdom for the common man." The *Essay on Man*, the *Moral Essays*, and the *Universal Prayer* were particularly popular, and numerous quotations from them found their way into the writings of Benjamin Franklin and the commonplace book of Thomas Jefferson. Because of their moral teachings, Pope's works were "more frequently reprinted during the colonial period than were those of any other English poet except Isaac Watts."

Pope's satires, says Miss Sibley, were never as popular in America as were the moral essays. During the Revolutionary period, however, they served Tory and patriot alike. Freneau read them avidly, and the Connecticut Wits were deeply indebted to them. Dislike of the "gross indecency of some passages" in the *Dunciad* and the *Satires* gave impetus to the revolt against Pope. The *North American Review* in the 1820's expressed its disgust, and over some of the passages, Mrs. Lydia Sigourney shuddered and cried, "Shame to the man! how well so e'er he write."

The chief censures of Pope by the American critics, Miss Sibley finds, closely paralleled those voiced by the English: his language and versification were artificial and too precise, and his subject-matter was unpoetic. Essays by Richard Henry Dana and W. H. Prescott exemplify this criticism. One wishes, however, for more information concerning the parallel between the American and the English censures and concerning the very significant tardiness of their reaching their height in America. One regrets that here as in other parts of the book—to quote the author—"no attempt has been made to look at the complete evidence."

Miss Sibley's book is interesting and readable but not thorough. Its casual manner and sketchy organization lessen its value for the serious student of Pope's rise and fall in America. Too often the focus is not on Pope but on the book trade, religion, elocution, or teaching methods. Phrasal echoes of Pope and imitations of his verse are purposely omitted. Two useful appendices list American editions of Pope and sales of his works by American booksellers. These, as well as the five brief chapters, contain some valuable items concerning the beginning of Pope's fame in America, but we still must wait for a sound foundation upon which to build the history of Pope's American reputation and influence.

JOHN O. EIDSON

University of Georgia

Thomas Hardy: The Novels and Stories. By ALBERT J. GUERARD.
Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xii,
177. \$3.50.

Critical evaluations of the work of Thomas Hardy multiply. This is as it should be, for every great writer, like every other great artist, makes a particular appeal to one generation and another to another. It is impossible to predict the future course of such an artist's after-fame, but it is safe to say that the present state of opinion will yield place to something different and that critics of the future will regard such criticism as Mr. Guerard's as "dated" and outmoded much as he regards the criticism of such "post-Victorians" as Professor Weber, Mr. Rutland, Lord David Cecil, and the present reviewer. These contrasts are of small importance except for their interest as expressions of changing taste. What is important is that a young critic of the mid-twentieth century is attracted to the task of interpreting and appraising Hardy's work. The "Lord of the Wessex Coasts" still appears before us in questionable shape. Answers to the questions which he propounds will vary from decade to decade and (perhaps) from age to age; but this may be said, that no answer can pretend to completeness

which does not take the poetry into account and no answer can be profound that is inclined to disregard the implicit or explicit "view of life" contained in the novels and the poetry. Mr. Guerard limits his study to the prose fiction, and appears to believe that the question is of little or no consequence whether Hardy was a fatalist, a mechanistic determinist, a pessimist, or a meliorist.

For him, Hardy is first and foremost a teller of tales, in the lineage of the anonymous ballad-writers, steeped in folklore tradition. Consequently Mr. Guerard accepts joyfully the preposterous exaggerations of coincidence and the approximations to the supernatural in incident which we critics of an elder generation were wont to deplore. He is the more ready to admire these characteristics of Hardy's books because he finds it possible to attach to many such incidents a "symbolic" interpretation. The fact that such symbolism was foreign to Hardy's mode of thought (at any rate, till towards the end of his career as a novelist) does not trouble Mr. Guerard; nor do I think it should trouble him, since a great artist may put into his work more than is apparent to himself.

In another respect this critical monograph is so typical of our present outlook that within a few years it may come to be regarded merely as a curious by-product of outmoded tastes and interests: there is considerable emphasis upon the psychology of sex, more than once in its abnormal manifestations. Lesbianism is discussed in connection with Hardy's first published novel; the way in which characters in the novels overhear conversations or peep and pry upon each other is connected with the behavior of *voyeurs* (how absurd!); and there is thought to be some sort of significance (perhaps connected with Hardy's own life and character—Mr. Guerard regrets the lack of a really candid biography) in the quietism and lack of assertiveness in most of Hardy's masculine characters.

Again, and very naturally, the comments are colored by the memories of bitter experiences undergone so recently by young men. The evil in the world is more apparent than the good. Hardy's all-embracing compassion is at a discount, though Mr. Guerard concedes that "there may be something to say for his charity." But this critic evidently is more in sympathy with Conrad's dark view of human nature than with Hardy's conviction that everyone gets from life less than he deserves.

S. C. CHEW

Bryn Mawr, College

Novels of Empire. By SUSANNE HOWE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. vii, 186. \$2.75.

Nearly two hundred novels, English, French, and German, are here passed in review. In tone, temper, purpose and outlook varied in the extreme, they all have this in common, that they deal with the problem of Europeans overseas, with colonial expansion, and the establishment of imperial domain. Dr. Howe draws clear and illuminating contrasts between many antitheses: the missionary as opposed to the trader; the idealist as opposed to the exploiter; the writer with a sense of "manifest destiny" as opposed to the writer who accepts the explanation that empires come almost by accident; the Frenchman who accepts difference of race as opposed to the Englishman who insists, or was wont to insist, upon racial superiority and inferiority; the Englishman who is rather proud of "muddling through" over against the Frenchman who boasts of his superior technique in colonial administration; the Englishman who, like Seeley, accepts the privileges of imperialism along with its "white man's burden" and who contrasts sharply with the German who, coming belatedly and jealously into the field, loudly asserts his right to "more room." In like manner contrasts are drawn in the novelists' delineation of India and Indo-China (where English and French fiction resemble one another) and of Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. One sees that India was too enormous for the English imagination and that the destiny of England there was—to leave the country. An ever-recurring note in English fiction dealing with India was that of home-sickness, that of the exile in an alien land. But Africa offered the appeal of the great open spaces, and earlier ideas of noble savages and earthly paradises are often juxtaposed to the complacent nineteenth-century belief that the primitive must give way before the advance of civilization. Of late, there has come into English novels on African themes a better understanding, grounded upon sympathy; and not only the black races but the Boers have had their advocates.

Many of these works of fiction, English and foreign, nineteenth-century or contemporary, have claims to be noticed not for their aesthetic value but as documents in the history of imperialistic expansion. Practical action often begins in sentiment, and sentiment is often inspired by the imagination of a novelist. Dr. Howe's monograph is therefore of importance to the political historian as well as to the student of literature. For the sake of the latter she might have given a fuller account of the controversy between imperialists and "Little Englanders," between, as it were, Sir John Seeley and Goldwin Smith. But she says enough to make the point at issue plain. She has organized her large mass of material very intelligently: various periods, various points of view, and various

parts of the world beyond Europe—the historical, the ideological, and the geographical approaches—are carefully integrated, yet kept distinct. Her style is perhaps a shade too sprightly, especially when, drawing analogies between certain novels and the cinema, she writes about “Hollywood Ready-Mades.” But she is always entertaining and informative. The book is well printed; I have noted only (p. 34) the error of “Malabar Hill” for the “Marabar Hills” in an allusion to the setting of Forster’s *Passage to India*.

Bryn Mawr, College

S. C. CHEW

Theaterstadt Berlin, Ein Almanach. Herausgegeben von HERBERT IHERING. Berlin: Verlag Bruno Henschel & Sohn, 1948. 375 pp., illustrated. DM 7.50.

Theater der Welt, Ein Almanach. Herausgegeben von HERBERT IHERING. Berlin: Verlag Bruno Henschel & Sohn, 1949. 216 pp., illustrated. DM 7.80.

Convinced that there is no other city in the world whose theater so completely reflects the great facets of contemporary life, Herbert Ihering has prepared two very informative volumes about the Berlin theater. Or, should one use the plural: theaters, since Fritz Erpenbeck reports that over 400 applications for theater permits and over one thousand applications for cabarets were filed by the autumn of 1945.

The first volume pulsates with expectancy against a background pungent with mixed emotions. The storm has passed; what has it swept before it, what has it left behind? The 45 articles which compose this Almanach look both ways—forward and backward! Carl Zuckmayer tells of his three most eventful years in Berlin: 1920, 1924, 1925. Fritz Kortner, absent 14 years, sends his “Gruss an das deutsche Theater” over the 6,000 miles between him and Berlin. Wolfgang Langhoff pays tribute to Karl Heinz Martins, late Director of the newly re-opened Hebbel Theater. The first plays? *Raub der Sabinerinnen*, *Der grüne Kakadu*, *Der Kammersänger*, *Die Parasiten*, and Wilder’s *Unsere kleine Stadt*. There are dramatic selections from Anna Seghers, Bertold Brecht and Günther Weissenborn.

The second volume is less exuberant, even a bit somber. Hopes have not been fulfilled. There is a tone of irritation. The West does not welcome all that the Russian Zone proposes. Weimar is farther from Frankfurt than in the time of Goethe.

A good share of this volume deals with Bertold Brecht. The first picture is from the *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder* which has

been sweeping the stage in all Zones. Eric Bentley recounts his heroic efforts to acquaint the American public, and especially the college stage, with Brecht's works (pp. 70-75, with five pictures). An article by Brecht: *Bemerkungen über die chinesische Schauspielkunst* (1936). An article about Brecht and *Mutter Courage* by Angelika Hurwicz, who plays *Katrin*. Four more pictures from *Mutter Courage*, one from the *Dreigroschenoper* and one from *Herr Puntila und sein Knecht*.

The Almanach reprints (from the French) a proposal of Paul Arnold's for an international exchange of manuscripts. Heinrich Mann pays tribute to Berlin—perhaps more wistfully than realistically. Ottofritz Gaillard, who published *Das Deutsche Stanislawskibuch* (Aufbau, 1948), reports on a trip to the Moscow theater—where the Germans could learn much, especially in respect to the staged epic (pp. 32-48). Very valuable is Ernst Niekisch's contribution: *Erinnerungen an Ernst Toller*. Niekisch was a fellow-prisoner with Toller and a later associate in Berlin.

The disturbing factor in these articles is the belligerent attitude towards everything which does not harmonize with the Party line. The first article in the second volume is a tirade against political conditions which divide Germany, but without any examination as to how these conditions arose. The last article, Goethe's "*Regeln für Schauspieler*" *heute gesehen*, refers in the last paragraph to our "klassenzerissene Welt."

The illustrations are numerous and excellent. They greatly enhance the books as documents of Germany's post-war theater. The two volumes together give the complete programs of the Berlin theaters from June 1945 to June 30, 1949. From these lists it should be possible to determine approximately how much of the Berlin theater is really German.

These two Almanachs will prove of inestimable value to students and research scholars. It is to be hoped that they will be followed by others from year to year.

EDMUND E. MILLER

University of Maryland,
Zurich, Switzerland

Die Erlebte Rede im Englischen Roman des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. By LISA GLAUSER. Bern: Verlag A. Francke Ag.; 1949. Pp. 155. Sw. Fr. 14.50. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, No. 20).

This is a sequel of Willi Bühler's monograph in the same series, *Die Erlebte Rede im Englischen Roman* (1937), which studied this kind of fictional discourse through eighteenth-century begin-

nings to its first important use, namely in the novels of Jane Austen. Dr. Glauser pursues the subject through nineteenth-century fiction to the work of Meredith. The technique which she studies is important enough to have received attention from such scholars as Oscar Walzel, Charles Bally, Etienne Lorck, and Leo Spitzer. She concludes her study with the statement that her historical survey of "die erlebte Rede" again proves it to be "a subtle, extremely flexible (wandlungsfähig), and expressive stylistic medium, which in delicate nuances can indicate the development of an author, and which is inseparately linked with his artistic purposes." I believe that this conclusion is justified by the historical evidence and aesthetic considerations which she and the other authorities have presented.

In my opinion, "die erlebte Rede" (sometimes translated "im-personating speech") is not a clearly descriptive phrase in German; and certainly a literal translation of it would be even foggier in English. What the phrase attempts to designate is the kind of talk in a novel which the reader feels to be exactly what the character himself would say, uncontaminated by the author's predilections or style; in other words, the recognizably natural expression of the character's independent personality as developed out of his own "erlebte" experience. When thus talking or self-communing, the character seems to come alive in at least temporarily complete independence of his author's influence. His author characterizes him by turning him loose and letting him talk as he pleases, or, rather, as under the circumstances he would naturally talk. The author's privilege of judging him is not thereby permanently relinquished; quite the contrary, the author allows the character to betray himself for better or for worse, and thereby makes the final verdict even clearer. This self-revealing talk may, like all other literary techniques, be used with results of very unequal value. It may exhibit merely the superficial peculiarities of a shallow character,—his dialect, local mannerisms, caricaturable single traits, etc. In some of the novelists whom Dr. Glauser surveys, especially those of the first half of the nineteenth-century, it does not often rise higher than that. Thackeray, with his artistic sensitiveness, appreciated its possibilities better than Dickens did. But it was the Brontës, George Eliot, and George Meredith, who most frequently and successfully employed the self-characterizing speech,—employing it not only to characterize but also to judge. To these authors, whose interests were psychological, it was one of the best means of reaching and revealing the depths of personality; and they had the qualities which enabled them to utilize it,—an intense interest in what lay below the surface of human actions, sympathetic imagination, in various degrees the power of temporarily suspending their own ego, and the dramatic skill of writing in styles which were not too markedly their own.

This is a good monograph on a difficult subject, a genuinely literary subject, the treatment of which required literary taste and the power of aesthetic discrimination as well as historical knowledge.¹

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

Kurze Deutsche Grammatik. Auf Grund der fünfbändigen Deutschen Grammatik von HERMANN PAUL eingerichtet von HEINZ STOLTE. Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1949. xv, 456 pp. RM. 14.30.

Als Hermann Paul vor vierzig Jahren an die Ausarbeitung seiner *Deutschen Grammatik* ging, galten bedächtige Breite der Darstellung, Fülle von entlegenen Details, Weitschweifigkeit der Argumente als hohe Qualitäten; die Anlage des Werkes in fünf Bänden war von vornherein geplant. Ernste Hindernisse verzögerten und verlangsamten die Durchführung, und nur die heroische Willensstärke des inzwischen erblindeten Gelehrten brachte den letzten Band im Jahre 1920 unter ein Notdach. Da aber war es für eine Großtat dieser Art aus zwei Gründen zu spät: die Verarmung der wissenschaftsfreudigen Schichten stand einer weiten Wirkung des Werkes im Wege, das im Übrigen gänzlich einer Epoche angehörte, deren Stunde schon vorüber war. Die gewaltige Sammelarbeit des greisen Gelehrten fand nur matte Anerkennung, man gestand sich verstohlen, daß man den ungeheuerlich ausgreifenden Text auf menschliches Maß zurechtstutzen müsse, um ihn überhaupt zu retten.

Die von Stolte vorgenommene Kürzung fasst nun die ersten vier Bände der alten Fassung zusammen; der fünfte (Wortbildungslehre) bleibt ausgeschlossen, da er, der ohnehin etwas misslungen war, durch die *Deutsche Wortbildung* von Walter Henzen (Halle 1947) mehr als nur ersetzt ist. Vielleicht hätte auch der erste, sprachgeschichtliche Teil der Schere zum Opfer fallen sollen, da ja an neueren Sprachgeschichten, die alle Paul weit hinter sich lassen, kein Mangel ist, und da die wirklich dauerhaften Leistungen Pauls wie aller Neugrammatiker in der Laut- und Formenlehre liegen, aber keineswegs auf sprachgeschichtlichem Feld. Die Fülle von lautlichen Details in ein sprach-historisches Denkbild einzutragen und organisch zu verbinden, war einer Philologen-Generation versagt, die es ja auch vor allem den Naturforschern nachtun wollte, d. h. dem historischen Sinn mißtraute. Das hat sich auch bei Paul gerächt, und selbst die starken Änderungen Stoltess haben hier nichts Wesentliches erreicht.

Das alte Kapitel 4 "Die Entstehung der Gemeinsprache"

¹ The proof-reading is careless; e. g., p. 16, "young"; p. 33, "Enlgand"; p. 36, "Tackeray"; and p. 155, "Edinburg."

zeigte schon 1916 eine Unbeholfenheit der Auffassung, für die es tiefere Gründe gab. Ein Absatz wie dieser:

Im 14. und 15. Jh. nehmen die Unterschiede in der geschriebenen Sprache zu, wie sie es jedenfalls in der gesprochenen taten. Zu alledem aber wuchs wohl die Differenz zwischen beiden, und kam die erstere noch mehr unter die Herrschaft der Tradition. Und bei allen Fortschritten der Spaltung bildet sich ein Ansatz zu der in den folgenden Jahrhunderten sich vollziehenden Einigung.

lautet in Stoltes Fassung kurz und bündig:

Im 14. und 15. Jh. nehmen die Unterschiede in der geschriebenen Sprache zu. Zudem wuchs der Abstand zwischen gesprochener und geschriebener Sprache, indem diese immer traditioneller wurde.

Freilich rettet der bessere Text den alten Unsinn nicht. — Der nun folgende § 147 war ursprünglich Luther gewidmet, dem "eigentlichen Begründer der nhd. Schriftsprache." In der Umschmelzung treten zwischen Ende des Mittel- und Anfang des Neuhochdeutschen eine ganze Anzahl von Vorformen der neuen Gemeinsprache, unter denen Kanzlei-Deutsch, Drucker-Deutsch und meissnische Mundart angeführt werden. Luther fasst dann diese Strahlungen nur wie in einem Brennglas zusammen; auch das nur vorübergehend, denn "das 16. Jh. blieb noch voll sich durchkreuzender Einflüsse." Blieb? — Am ehesten befriedigt in diesen "geschichtlichen Grundlagen," daß sie die alten 135 Seiten auf ein Drittel zusammendrängen; die Blickrichtung bleibt aber immer weiter neugrammatisch und mechanistisch: Es bildet *sich* etwas, ein Abstand *wird* grösser, ein Vokal *nähert sich* einem andern . . . oder statt der anonymen Macht 'es' ist es auch mal schnell eine Maschine; da ist dann die Druckerpresse verantwortlich für die geistesgeschichtliche Tatsache der Absage an die lockeren Gebräuche der Umgangssprache und das Programm einer streng geregelten Sprachzucht. —

Weit glücklicher ist Stoltes Neufassung der Syntax, der Behagels Bücher stark zugute kamen und die nun in ihrer gedrängten Deutlichkeit und Lakonik das weitaus Beste ist, was wir haben. Hier sind die starken Eingriffe Stoltes durchweg Besserungen. — Da auch die Teile, die Pauls Laut- und Formenlehre enthalten, von unvergleichlicher Solidität sind, sollte dem neu erstandenen "Paul" ein dauernder Erfolg beschieden sein.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

BRIEF MENTION

A Glossary of the New Criticism. By WILLIAM ELTON. Chicago, The Modern Poetry Association, 232 E. Erie St., 1949. Pp. 48. \$1.00. Competent systematic lexicography of the terms of literary criticism is one of the most obviously urgent needs of current philology. There has been no response to the appeal made some years ago by Herbert Read for a supplement to the *NED* which should do for critical terminology what that work attempted for the general vocabulary. Perhaps such a work would be too much for one man; it might well be the collective labor of a group in the Modern Language Association. The diachronic aspect in such a survey would of course be more important than the synchronic, since it may be assumed that those equipped to profit from such aids would be generally aware of present usage; but apart from historical background, much could be supplied in a confused period like ours merely by careful study of contemporary application and context. It is to this exclusively that Mr. Elton's attention is directed in his *Glossary*, which lists a great number of the chief terms used by a selected group of living critics, for many of which he has assembled illuminating commentary. The unevenness of this commentary is the chief limitation of the work; its chief utility is in providing running bibliography for more extended study, and occasional shrewd suggestion of the direction such study should take. These services could have been performed as well by a short essay on a smaller selection of terms, and it is as such an essay that the work is best approached and judged. The glossarial framework is in fact incidental, and has the disadvantage of suggesting lexicographical responsibilities, of the kind I have referred to, which this little work makes no pretense of fulfilling.

Mr. Elton in an introduction and a short "basic bibliography" makes fairly clear what he means by "the so-called new criticism" (p. 3), but much of the body of his pamphlet increases one's conviction that this tiresome phrase ought to be purged from our jargon. Such use as it has is purely journalistic; it has no place in serious discussion of the important problems its continued employment serves only to embroil, quite apart from its annoying suggestion that if there indeed be any old criticism it has been or is being superseded, and that to be up-to-date in "criticism," or to traffic with it at all, is to support as a partisan a specific sect of critics the actual membership of which cannot be specified.

CRAIG LA DRIÈRE

The Catholic University of America.

The Criticism of T. S. Eliot; problems of an "impersonal theory" of poetry. By VICTOR H. BROMBERT. New Haven, Yale University Press; London, G. Cumberlege: Oxford University Press, 1949. Pp. 42. \$2.00. Mr. Brombert divides this Yale Undergraduate Prize Essay into three parts. In the first, he presents in sympathetic outline those aspects of Eliot's fundamental theory which are summed up in the quotation from "Tradition and the individual talent" that serves as its headpiece: "Honest criticism and sensitive appreciation are directed not upon the poet but upon poetry." In the second part he expands for more ample consideration what Eliot has to say about the problem of belief; and in the third he offers his own—still sympathetic—criticisms chiefly of contradictions and confusions he has observed, with some attempt to explain the genesis of these in Eliot's mind. That was a task that required more than logic and taste, both of which Mr. Brombert possesses (though sometimes the second fails him when he chooses words; he talks about "judging literature intrinsically" and "intrinsic literary criticism," and Eliot's finding "that the thought content had to be a definite criterion for assessing the over-all merit of a work,"—but this is not his usual style). Further probing would perhaps resolve some of the contradictions he notes; with those that would remain more could be done than is done here. Mr. Brombert is impatient, as youth may be, with an "inveterate habit" he detects in Eliot "of making subtle distinctions" (p. 25), and reproves his subject for "oversimplifying the issue by too neat a compartmentalization of different categories of values" (p. 17). More inveterate readers of Eliot's criticism may esteem its theoretical part for just these elements in it which Mr. Brombert thinks too often "dangerously close to sophistry" (p. 22), though they must agree to many of his objections, and even possibly to his suggestion that "a good case could probably be made" for "a steady decline in the quality and critical acuteness"—is not this a subtle distinction?—"of Eliot's recent prose" (p. 31). They will probably conclude that, though Mr. Brombert gives an adequate general account of his subject, he does less than justice to the subtlety of its complex detail.

CRAIG LA DRIÈRE

The Catholic University of America.

Le Panorama littéraire de l'Europe (1833-1834). Une Revue légitimiste sous la Monarchie de Juillet. By THOMAS R. PALFREY. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern U. Press, 1950. Pp. vi + 154. (Northwestern U. Studies, Humanities Series, 22.) Dr. Palfrey shows that this journal, directed by Edouard Mennechet, owed its origin to the conservative tendencies of a group that had constituted the Société des Bonnes Lettres in the 1820's, and that it

was modeled on *L'Europe littéraire*, a journal whose history he published in 1927. The aim of the *Panorama* throughout its brief existence was to advance the cause of the Church and that of the older branch of Bourbons, dispossessed in 1830, but the method of 1833 differed from that of 1834. In the former more articles were foreign in origin than French, whereas the opposite was the case in 1834. The contributions dealing with foreign material were largely translations, among which German came first, then English. More surprising is the presence of translations from Russian and from Scandinavian languages. The choice of what was to be translated was determined less by the eminence of the authors than by the support their views gave to French conservatives. Most of the French contributors are now forgotten, but they included Chateaubriand, Charles Nodier, Paulin Paris, Jules de Rességuier, Alexandre Soumet, and Eugène Sue. Dr. Palfrey has set all this forth in 83 pages, which are followed by 28 pages devoted to the *table des matières* of the journal with a brief comment on each article, and by an appendix that lists the editors of the *Panorama* and its contributors with a short account of each person and with bibliographical references. The care with which the work has been done is admirable. The publication will, I hope, be a forerunner of one written with the same understanding and clarity, but devoted to a French journal of greater importance than the *Panorama*.

H. C. L.

A Reference Guide to Travel Literature. Volume III (England). By E. G. Cox. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1949. Pp. xiii + 732. \$10.00. A carefully indexed and fully annotated bibliographical directory dealing with the following topics: tours by natives, tours by foreigners, descriptions, views, towns, castles, seats, London, the universities, spas, canals, rivers, fen drainage, ancient and present state, surveys, geography, expeditions, history and chronicle, history and antiquities British, Roman, and Saxon antiquities, ecclesiastical history and antiquities, natural history, agriculture, husbandry, gardening, aids to travelers, maps and charts, letters, diaries, memoirs, reference works, and bibliographies. An indispensable reference work for students in all phases of literary history.

D. C. A.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Altick, R. D.—The Scholar Adventures. *New York*: Macmillan, 1950. Pp. x + 338. \$5.00.

Beaver, Joseph.—Walt Whitman—Poet of Science. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1951. Pp. xviii + 178. \$2.75.

Cordasco, Francesco.—A Bibliography of Thomas Frognall Dibdin. *Brooklyn*: Long Island Univ. Press, 1950. Pp. 12. (18th Century Bibliographical Pamphlets, 6.).

— An Introduction to 18th Century Medical Bibliography, with a Handlist of Medical References and Bibliographies Published in the 18th Century. *Brooklyn*: Long Island Univ. Press, 1950. Pp. 11. (18th Century Bibliographical Pamphlets, 7.)

Crane, Ronald S., Bredvold, Louis I., Bond, Richmond P., Friedman, Arthur, and Landa, Louis A. (eds.)—English Literature, 1660-1800, a Bibliography of Modern Studies Compiled for *Philological Quarterly*, vol. 1. *Princeton*: Princeton Univ. Press, 1950. Pp. 575. \$5.00.

Daiches, David.—Robert Burns. *New York*: Rinehart, 1950. Pp. viii + 376. \$2.00, paper; \$3.00, cloth.

Donner, H. W.—Svenska Översättningar av Shakespeare's Macbeth. I. Schillers Inflytande på Geijers Översättning. *Abo*: Abo Akademi, 1950. Pp. x + 148.

Dryden, John.—Prologues and Epilogues. Ed. William B. Gardner. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, for the Univ. of Texas, 1951. Pp. xxii + 361. \$4.50.

Dunn, William P.—Sir Thomas Browne: a Study in Religious Philosophy. *Minneapolis*: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1950. Pp. viii + 182. \$3.00.

Frédérrix, Pierre.—Herman Melville. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1950. Pp. 287.

French, J. Milton (ed.)—The Life Records of John Milton. Vol. II. *New Brunswick, N. J.*: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1950. Pp. viii + 395. \$5.00.

Jost, Karl.—Wulfstanstudien. *Bern*: Francke, 1950. Pp. 271. S. Fr. 22.50. (Swiss Studies in English, 23.)

Lindkvist, Karl-Gunnar.—Studies on the Local Sense of the Prepositions *In, At, On, and To* in Modern English. *Lund*: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1950. Pp. 429. 19 Swedish crowns. (Lund Studies in English, 20.)

Miles, Josephine—The Primary Language of Poetry in the 1640's. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: Univ. of California Press, 1948. Pp. 160. (U. of Cal. Publ. in English, 19, no. 1.)

— The Primary Language of Poetry in the 1740's and 1840's. *Ibid.*, 1950. (U. of Cal. Publ. in Eng., 19, no. 2.)

Moore, Olin H.—The Legend of Romeo and Juliet. *Columbus*: Ohio State U. Press, 1950. Pp. x + 167. \$4.50.

Newmark, Maxim (ed.)—Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 245. \$6.00.

Peacock, M. L., Jr.—The Critical Opinions of William Wordsworth. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1950. Pp. xxvi + 469. \$6.00.

Rochester.—Poems on Several Occasions, ed. James Thorpe. *Princeton*: U. Press, 1950. Pp. xxxviii + 196. \$5.00.

Scottish National Dictionary, Vol. 3, part 3. *Aberdeen*: Scottish National Dictionary Assoc., 1950. Pp. 31-142.

Shakespeare.—Antony and Cleopatra, ed. John Dover Wilson. *Cambridge [New York]*: Cambridge U. Press, 1950. Pp. xlv + 262. \$2.50.

Thuresson, Bertil.—Middle English Occupational Terms. *Lund*: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1950. Pp. 285. 145 Swedish crowns. (Lund Studies in English, 19.)

Walker, Franklin.—A Literary History of Southern California. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: Univ. of California Press, 1950. Pp. x + 282. \$3.75.

GERMAN

Baumgarten, Franz Ferdinand.—Das Werk Conrad Ferdinand Meyers. Hrsg. v. Hans Schuhmacher. *Zurich*: Scientia [1948]. 280 pp. Fr. 12.50.

Bock, Karl N.—Mittelniederdeutsch und heutiges Plattdeutsch im ehemaligen dänischen Herzogtum Schleswig. Studien zur Beleuchtung des Sprachwechsels in Angeln und Mittelschleswig. [Det kgl. danske videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. Bd. 31, Nr. 1]. *København*: Munksgaard, 1948. Kr. 24.

Bräm, E. Max—Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von ihren Anfängen bis zu Gegenwart. *Freiburg*: Verlag der Internationalen Bibliothek, 1949. 507 pp.

Braun, Walther.—Die Elbinger Mundart. Ein volkstümliches Wörterbuch. [Elbinger Hefte. H. 1/2.] *Essen-Kettwig*: West-Verl. 1949. 55 pp. M. 4.20.

* **Busch, Ernst.**—Goethes Religion, die Faust-Dichtung in christlicher Sicht. *Tübingen*: Fricke-Verlag, 1949. 377 pp.

* **Daur, Albert.**—Die Tragödie Fausts. Ein Versuch. *Heidelberg*: Winter [1948]. 91 pp. M. 2.-

* **Diels, Paul.**—Zur slavischen und germanischen Formenbildung. [Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akad. d. Wiss. Philos.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1948, H. 7]. *München*: Biedersheim in. Komm. 1949. 39 pp. M. 3.70.

* **Dosenheimer, Elise.**—Das deutsche soziale Drama von Lessing bis Sternheim. [*Konstanz*:] Südverlag [1949]. 350 pp. M. 8.20.

* **Federmann, Arnold.**—Der junge Goethe und England. Essays. [*Berlin*] Erich Schmidt, [1949]. 211 pp. M. 7.80.

* **Flemming, Willi.**—Goethes Gestaltung des klassischen Theaters. *Köln*: Schaffstein [1949]. 226 pp. M. 6.80.

* **Focke, Alfred, S. J.**: Liebe und Tod. Versuch einer Deutung u. Auseinandersetzung mit Rainer Maria Rilke. *Wien*: Herder, 1948. 188 pp. S. 26.-

* **Hamann, Johann Georg.**—Sämtliche Werke. [Historisch kritische Ausg. v. Josef Nadler]. Bd. 1. Tagebuch eines Christen. *Wien*: Herder [1949]. 349 pp. S. 67.

* **Hardt, Ernst.**—Zwei Goethe—Essays—Dramen des Mannes. Dramen des Alters. [Anker-Bücherei, Bd. 47]. *Stuttgart*: Klett [1949]. 64 pp. M. 1.80.

* **Hermann, Eduard.**—Eine unbeachtete Überlieferung des preussischen Vokabulars Simon Grumans. [Nachrichten d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen. [I.] Philol.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1949, Nr. 6]. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [1949]. Pp. 151-166. M. 1.50.

* **Hildebrandt, Kurt.**—Goethes Naturerkenntnis. *Hamburg-Bergedorf*: Stromverlag [1948]. 379 pp. M. 6.80.

* **Hoffmeister, Johannes.**—Der Abschied. Eine dichtungskundliche Studie. *Hameln*: F. Seifert, 1949. 94 pp. M. 4.50.

* **Hundt, Rudolf.**—Goethe und die Geologie Ost-thüringens. *Gera*: Thüringer Volksverlag, 1949. 52 + 8 pp. M. 6.-

* **Huppelsberg, Joachim.**—Rainer Maria Rilke. Biographie. *München*: Drei Eichen-Verlag [1949]. 90 pp. M. 3.90.

* **Huppert, Otto.**—Humanismus und Christentum. Goethe und Lavater, die Tragik einer Freundschaft. [Blaue Bändchen, 229]. *Stuttgart*: Loepthien [1949]. 79 pp. 75 Pf.

* **Jungandreas, Wolfgang.**—Geschichte der deutschen und d. englischen Sprache. [In 6 T.] T. 1. Vom Urgermanischen bis zum Beginn der literar. Zeit. 2. durchges. Aufl.

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949. 119 pp. M. 4.80.

* **Kienle, Richard von.**—Gotische Texte. Mit einem Glossar. [Sprachwissenschaftliche Studienbücher]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1948. 103 pp. M. 3.90.

* **Körner, Josef.**—Bibliographisches Handbuch des deutschen Schrifttums. 3. umgearb u. wesentlich verm. Aufl. *Bern*: A. Francke, 1949. 644 pp. Fr. 59.-

* **Krennbauer, Franz.**—Goethe und der Staat. Die Staatsidee des Unpolitischen. *Wien*: Springer-Verl. 1949. vii, 98 pp. S. 30.-

* **Lester, Conrad H.**—Zur literarischen Bedeutung Oswalds von Wolkenstein. *Wien*: Zeit u. Zukunft, 1949. 111 pp. S. 16.-

* **Mann Viktor.**—Wir waren fünf. Bildnisse der Familie Mann. Mit 35 Tafeln. *Konstanz*: Südverlag [1949]. 612 pp. M. 14.80.

* **Schier, Bruno.**—Die Namen des Kürschners. [Technologisches Pelzfach-Wörterbuch, Nr. 4] *Leipzig*: Hermelin-Verl. 1949. 32 pp. M. 1.50.

* **Schmid, Karl.**—Vom Geist der neueren Schweizer Dichtung. Ein Vortrag. *Stuttgart*, Engelhorn verl. [1949]. 21 pp. M. 1.80.

* **Schubart Fikentscher, Gertrud.**—Goethes sechshundfünfzig Strassburger Thesen vom 6. August 1771. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. d. dt. Rechtswissenschaft. *Weimar*: Böhlau, 1949. 137 pp. M. 5.40.

* **Schwarz, Ernst.**—Deutsche Namensforschung. 1. Ruf- u. Familiennamen. 2. Orts- und Flurnamen. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949, 1950. 228, 322 pp. M. 27.-

* **Viëtor, Karl.**—Der junge Goethe. Neue Ausgabe. *Bern*: A. Francke A. G. [1950]. 190 pp. Fr. 5.80.

* **Weisgerber, Joh-Leo.**—Der Sinn des Wortes "Deutsch." *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949. 192 pp. M. 10.80.

FRENCH

* **Addamiano, Natale.**—Guy de Maupassant. La vita e l'opera. *Rome*: Ausonia, 1949. 425 pp. L. 1500.

* **Angers, Pierre.**—Commentaire à l'"Art poétique" de Paul Claudel. *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1949. 391 pp. Fr. 360.

* **Balzac.**—Un début dans la vie, éd. Guy Robert et Georges Matoré. *Geneva*: Droz, 1950. lxxvi + 251 pp.

* **Balzac.**—Lettres à sa famille, 1809-50, éd. W. S. Hastings. *Paris*: Albin Michel, 1950. xlii + 558 pp.

Béguin, Albert. — Georges Bernanos. *Paris*: Eds. du Seuil, 1949. 383 pp. Fr. 480.

Bement, N. S. — Intermediate French. *New York*: American Book Co., 1950. xiv + 264 pp. \$2.50.

Blanchot, Maurice. — Lautréamont et Sade. *Paris*: Eds. de Minuit, 1949. 271 pp. Fr. 300.

Blinkenberg, Andreas. — Le Problème de l'accord en français moderne, essai d'une typologie. *Copenhagen*: Munksgaard, 1950. 180 pp.

Centonze, Ferruccio. — Molière e la sua commedia. *Milan*: Gastaldi, 1949. 92 pp. L. 250.

Chaigne, Louis. — Aspects d'André Maurois et de son œuvre. *Strasbourg*: Le Roux, 1949. 38 pp.

Chardon, Pierre. — Expliquez-moi Marcel Proust. *Paris*: Foucher, 1949. 80 pp. Fr. 75.

Chinard, Gilbert (éd.). — Une sœur aînée d'Atala: *Odérachi*, histoire américaine. *Paris*: Clavreuil, 1950. 247 pp. Fr. 270.

Cohn, R. G. — Mallarmé's *Un Coup de dé*; an Exegesis. *New Haven*: Yale French Studies, 1949. 139 pp.

Cresson, André. — Ernest Renan, sa vie, son œuvre avec un exposé de sa philosophie. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1949. 128 pp. Fr. 120.

Denœu, François (éd.). — Lectures littéraires pour commençants. *New York*: Macmillan, 1950. x + 191 pp. \$2.50.

Diderot. — Pensées philosophiques. Ed. crit par Robert Niklaus. *Geneva*: Droz, 1950. xxvi + 69 pp.

Fenger, Henning. — Voltaire et le théâtre anglais. *Orbis litterarum*, VII, fasc. 3-4. *Copenhagen*: Glydendal, 1949 [Feb., 1950]. 126 pp.

Frizzle, A. L. — A Study of Some of the Influences of Regents Requirements and Examinations in French. *New York*: Teachers College, Columbia U., 1950. xii + 154 pp. \$2.75.

Gautier de Coinci. — Du Clerc qui fame espousa et puis la lessa, miracle publ. d'après 15 mss. *Helsinki*: Acad. Scientiarum Fennica, 1950. 140 pp.

Guischard, J. A. — Le Conte fantastique au XIX^e siècle. *Montreal*: Fides, 1950. 181 pp.

Locke, W. N. — Pronunciation of the French Spoken at Brunswick, Me. *Greenboro, N. C.*: Am. Dialect Soc., 1950. 201 pp. \$3.00.

Mackenzie, C. F. and Others. — Studies in

French Lang., Lit., and Hist. presented to R. L. Graeme Ritchie. *Cambridge*: U. Press, 1949. xvi + 250 pp. 25 s.

Micks, W. and A. Hill (eds.). — Early French Writers in Mod. Fr. *New York*: New Directions, 1949. xi + 341 pp. \$2.50.

— Twentieth Century French Writers. *Ibid.*, 1950. viii + 310 pp. \$2.50.

Pasquet, André. — Ernest Pinard et le procès de "Madame Bovary." *Paris*: Eds. savoir, vouloir, pouvoir, 1949. 24 pp.

Rhodes, S. A. — Gérard de Nerval, 1808-55, Poet, Traveler, Dreamer. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1951. xii + 416 pp. \$4.75.

Richards, Marguerite L. — Le Comique de Courteline. *Montreal*: Copyright de l'auteur, 1950. 371 pp.

Thorpe, Lewis (éd.). — Le Roman de Laurin fils de Marques le Sénéchal. *Cambridge, Eng.*: Bowes & Bowes, 1950. xiv + 327 pp. 25 s.

Voltaire. — Correspondance avec les Tronchin, éd. crit. par André Delattre. *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1950. xiv + 800 pp.

— Lettres inédites aux Tronchin avec une introd. par Bernard Gagnebin. 3 v. *Geneva*: Droz, 1950. xl + 301 + 246 + 259 pp.

Walton, L. B. — Anatole France and the Greek World. *Durham*: Duke U. Press, 1950. x + 334 pp. \$6.00.

Warnant, Léon. — La Culture en Hesbaye liégeoise. Etude ethnographique et dialectologique. *Brussels*: Palais des Académies, 1949. 254 pp.

ITALIAN

Alziator, Francesco. — La letteratura in Sardegna dalle origini al periodo bizantino. *Cagliari*: Tip. Centrale, 1950. 14 pp.

Batani, Maria. — La lirica di Francesco Petrarca. *Bologna*: Casciano, Cappelli, 1950. 124 pp. L. 300.

Benini, Alieto. — Il tramonto di Dante nella città del silenzio. *Ravenna*: Arti grafiche, 1949. 83 pp.

Boschi, Egidio. — Giacomo Leopardi. *Alba*: Ed. Paoline, 1948. 299 pp.

Casciola, Brizio. — L'enimma dantesco. *Bergamo*: Arti grafiche, 1950. 381 pp. L. 900.

Chiari, A. e I. Marchetti. — L'autre della "Nencia da Barberino." *Milan*: Marzorati, 1948. 143 pp.

D'Annunzio, Mario. — Con mio padre sulla nave del ricordo. *Milan*: Mondadori, 1950. 222 pp. L. 800.

Hayward, A. L. — Colloquial Italian.

Forest Hills, N. Y.: Transatlantic, 1948. 142 pp. \$1.50.

Livingston, Arthur.—Essays in Italian Literature. *New York*: Vanni, 1950. 197 pp. \$3.50.

Monticone, Severino.—Giulio Salvadori il poeta dell'umile Italia. *Alba*: Ed. Paoline, 1948. 259 pp.

Olschki, Leonardo.—Genius of Italy. *New York*: Oxford, 1949. vii + 481 pp. \$6.00.

— The Myth of Felt. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1949. 77 pp.

Reynolds, Barbara.—Linguistic Writings of Alessandro Manzoni. *Cambridge, Eng.*: Heffer, 1950. viii + 225 pp. 15s.

Rutigliano, Maria.—Sulle "Grazie" del Foscolo. *Palo del Colle (Bari)*: Liantonio, 1950. 109 pp.

Scotti, R. M.—Carducci tra classicismo e romanticismo. *Bari*: Resta, 1950. ix + 101 pp. L. 450.

Sirven, Paul.—Vittorio Alfieri. *Paris*: Boivin, 1949. 272 pp. Fr. 250.

Toffanin, Giuseppe.—Storia dell'umanesimo. 3 v. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1950. viii + 179 + xi + 415 + vii + 202 pp. L. 2400.

Vailati, Maria.—Il tormento artistico del Tasso dalla "Liberata" alla "Conquistata." *Milan*: Marzorati, 1950. 79 pp.

Vannucci, Pasquale.—Pascoli e gli Scolopi. *Rome*: Signorelli, 1950. vii + 395 pp. L. 1000.

Weiss, Roberto.—Un inedito petrarchesco. La redazione sconosciuta di un capitolo del "Trionfo della fama." *Rome*: Storia e lett., 1950. 87 pp.

SPANISH

Alvarez Quintero.—El centenario and Doña Hormiga, ed. A. M. Brady and H. L. Smith. *New York*: Dryden, 1950. xxiv + 220 pp. \$1.75.

Amateau, E. I.—Repasemos, ed. L. Cabat. *New York*: Republic Bk. Co., 1949. 218 + 30 pp. \$45.

Barr, Glenn (ed.)—Cuatro Cuentos rioplatenses. *Boston*: Heath, 1950. iv + 60 pp. \$64.

Blasi, Ferruccio.—La poesia epica spagnola. *Messina*: O. S. P. E., 1950. 143 pp. L. 1500.

Brent, A. and R. Krisner (eds.)—Cuentos españoles. *New York*: Holt, 1950. vii + 143 + lxiv pp. \$2.20.

Browne, J. R. (ed.)—Stories of the Spanish-speaking World. *Boston*: Ginn, 1950. x + 260 pp. \$2.75.

Castellano, J. R.—Estampas sudamericanas, ed. M. C. Dillingham. *New York*: Appleton, 1950. x + 287 pp. \$2.50.

Hammond, J. H.—Francisco Santos' indebtedness to Gracián. *Austin*: U. of Tex. Press, 1950. iv + 102 pp. (U. of Tex. Hispanic Studies, I.)

Krauss, Werner.—Die Welt im spanischen Sprichwort. *Wiesbaden*: Limes-Verlag, 1946. 91 pp.

Mateu y Llopis, Felipe.—Glosario hispánico de numismática. *Barcelona*: C. S. I. C., 1946. xix + 229 pp.

Metford, J. C. J.—British Contributions to Spanish and Spanish-American Studies. *London and N. Y.*: Longmans, Green, 1950. 86 pp. 2/6.

Robb, L. A.—Dictionary of Business Terms; Sp.-Eng. and Eng.-Sp. *London*: Chapman, 1950. xii + 219 pp. 32s.

Romera-Navarro, M.—Estudios sobre Gracián. *Austin*: U. of Tex. Press, 1950. vi + 146 pp. (U. of Tex. Hispanic Studies, II.)

Turk, L. H. and A. M. Brady (eds.)—Cuentos y comedias de América. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1950. xxx + 318 pp. \$2.20.

CHINESE AND JAPANESE

De Francis, John.—Nationalism and Language Reform in China. *Princeton*: U. Press, 1950. xii + 306 pp. \$4.00.

Tatsumi, Henry S.—Idiomatic Japanese. Forms of greeting; useful phrases; pronunciation. *Seattle*: Far Eastern Press, 1950. 15 pp.

GENERAL

Bogan, Louise.—Works in the Humanities Published in Great Britain 1939-46. A Selective List. *Washington*: Library of Congress, 1950. 123 pp. lithographed.

Heffner, R.-M. S.—General Phonetics. *Madison*: U. of Wis. Press, 1949. [Sept., 1950]. xx + 253 pp. \$7.50.

Leach, Maria and Jerome Fried (eds.)—Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology, and Legend. T. II, J.-Z. *New York*: Funk & Wagnalls, 1950. 665 pp. \$7.50.

Memorandum for Authors, Editors, Composers, Proofreaders on the preparation of MSS. and the handling of proof. *Princeton*: U. Press (1950). 21 pp.

Ségur, Nicolas.—Histoire de la littérature européenne. T. II. Moyen-âge et Renaissance. *Paris*: Attinger, 1950. 351 pp. Fr. 630.

951

neri-
ork:

In-
Tex.
His-

chen
rlag,

his-
S. I.

ions
dies.
950.

ness
lon:

obre
950.
dies,

).—
ton:
8 pp.

Lan-
U.

nese.
pro-
ress,

ities
A
of

tics.
ept.,

).—
y of
II,
950.

com-
n of
ton:

ture
ais-
pp.

ri-
k:

in-
ex.
is-

en
ag,

is-
I.

ns
es.
50.

ess
n:

ore
50.
es,

—
n:
p.

m-
U.

se.
ro-
ss,

ies
A
of

es.
t.,

—
of
II,
50.

m-
of
m:

ire
is-
pp.

Princeton

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Reinterpretation of Victorian Literature

Edited by JOSEPH E. BAKER. The Victorian Literature Group of the MLA reconsiders some of the common modern opinions about the Victorians—their alleged priggishness, dogmatism and imperialism, and bring the Victorian era into clearer focus. \$3.75

English Literature, 1660-1800

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MODERN STUDIES

Edited by LOUIS LANDA et al. The first of two volumes making available the annual bibliographies of 18th century scholarship published for the past 25 years in the *Philological Quarterly*. Original issues are exactly reproduced with all critical annotations. Volume I includes the years 1926-1938. 575 pages, \$5.00

English Poetic Theory, 1825-1865

By ALBA H. WARREN, JR. Critical documents of Newman, Keble, Mill, Carlyle, Hunt, Browning, Dallas, Arnold, and Ruskin are closely analyzed in a study of the character of poetic theory of the middle years of the 19th century. No. 29 *Princeton Studies in English*. \$3.00

At your bookstore, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS



A NEW EDITION of a CLASSIC PLAY

Andromaque

(Roach and Ledésert)

RACINE



THE SPECIAL FEATURES of this new edition make the text especially useful for students at the intermediate level. A complete, scholarly introduction on the life and works of Racine is followed by Notes on French Versification and a critical appreciation of the play. There is a reference bibliography on the works of Racine, and a complete end-vocabulary. Professors who have been looking for a fine series of single plays will welcome this book.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

MODERN FRENCH LANGUAGE SERIES

State Adopted in
Louisiana, Mississippi
Tennessee, Utah, Nevada

by Travis



Cours Elementaire de Francais . . .	\$1.75
Cours Moyen de Francais—Part 1 . . .	2.25
Cours Moyen de Francais—Part 2 . . .	2.50

This series is widely used, not only in the United States, but throughout Canada and England. Each book contains ample reading material as well as a great variety of exercises for developing conversational French and grammar. Phonograph records with models of the vowel sounds, consonants, and correct pronunciation of the French, including a rendition in French of some of the stories and the poems, are available.

THE ECCLESIA LATIN READER—
Sisters of St. Joseph \$1.80
GREEK VERB BLANK—Vaughn40
A convenient time-saving device for mastering the difficult Greek verbs.

TRANSLATIONS

We can supply English editions of the best-known classical and modern foreign-language texts of all publishers if they are available.

Write for free catalog MN.

NOBLE & NOBLE, Publishers, Inc.
67 Irving Place New York 3, N. Y.

A 2nd Printing of
Stefán Einarsson's

ICELANDIC

Grammar—Texts—Glossary

6 x 9 539 pages

A grammar, text, and glossary all in one, this volume is designed for immediate and practical use as an up to date guide to the Icelandic language. \$5.50

ORDER TODAY

The Johns Hopkins Press
Baltimore 18, Maryland